

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 12628) to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of Public Works Administration slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects, to authorize payments to States and political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on such premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFARLANE: A bill (H. R. 12629) to provide the Congress with information on the state of the development of the aerial war craft of the United States in comparison with that of other nations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 12630) to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of Public Works Administration slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects, to authorize payments to States and political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on such premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 12631) to amend section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270); to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 582) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 12632) granting an increase of pension to Florence A. Clarkson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12633) for the relief of George J. Zeigler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 12634) for the relief of M. Leslie Martin; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 12635) granting a pension to Milka N. Robbins, and minor child; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12636) for the relief of Harry Francis Zeller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LUCKEY: A bill (H. R. 12637) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Westbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 12638) for the relief of Patricia Swan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 12639) for the relief of Marcello Milani; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 12640) for the relief of Harold King Boyce; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12641) granting a pension to Joseph Dion; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12642) granting a pension to Bertha C. Keith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12643) granting a pension to Ida B. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 12644) to refund income and profit taxes erroneously collected on storage batteries; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 12645) for the relief of David Leo Lieb; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10846. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the United Upholsters' Union of New York, Local No. 44, U. C. L. M. I. U. of N. A., endorsing and requesting the enactment of legislation for the creation of a court of appeals for civil-service employees with a set-up of national and local machinery and

with employee's representation thereon through his recognized union representative as outlined in the Pearson bill (H. R. 9258); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10847. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Housing, urging the enactment of Senate bill 4424 and House bill 12164; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10848. By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the Associated General Contractors of Minnesota, urging Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to provide Federal-aid funds sufficient to conduct Federal-aid highway work during the fiscal year 1937 without interruption; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10849. Also, petition of the Central Labor Union, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 8293, pertaining to the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10850. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition signed by residents in Rockland County, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 5051, which proposes the repeal of section 213 of the Economy Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10851. By Mr. NICHOLS: Petition of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; to the Committee on Flood Control.

10852. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to maintain the Civilian Conservation Corps at its present quota of 500,000 men for another year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10853. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the conference of mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., concerning the George bill (S. 2883); to the Committee on Education.

10854. By Mr. TERRY: Petition of the northwest district of the Catholic Union of Arkansas, in the interest of the program of the Arkansas Valleys Association for the construction of flood-control reservoirs on the Arkansas and White Rivers, tributaries of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1936

(Legislative day of Friday, Apr. 24, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 7, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of the parents of Albert Thesing, Jr.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8234) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of a heroic Pioneer Memorial, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 158. An act authorizing the President to present a medal in the name of Congress to Johannes F. Jensen;

S. 427. An act authorizing the reimbursement of Edward B. Wheeler and the State Investment Co. for the loss of certain lands in the Mora grant, New Mexico;

S. 1494. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims", approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 555);

S. 2040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, and acts in amendment thereof;

S. 2517. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Walter M. Graesser, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired;

S. 2611. An act to authorize the Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association to construct and maintain a monument on the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Salt Lake City, Utah;

S. 2849. An act to provide funds for cooperation with Wellpinit School District No. 49, Stevens County, Wash., for the construction of a public-school building to be available for Indian children of the Spokane Reservation;

S. 3241. An act authorizing adjustment of the claims of F. L. Forbes, John L. Abbot, and the Ralph Sollitt & Sons Construction Co.;

S. 3372. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school district at Hays, Mont., for construction and improvement of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children;

S. 3460. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the persons entitled to compensation on account of private claim 111, parcel 1, Nambe Pueblo grant;

S. 3516. An act for the relief of Alice D. Hollis;

S. 3544. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Texas Pacific-Missouri Pacific Terminal Railroad of New Orleans;

S. 3581. An act for the relief of Henry Thornton Meriwether;

S. 3687. An act to validate payments, and to relieve the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army on account of payments made to Reserve officers on active duty for rental allowances;

S. 3688. An act to validate payments, and to relieve disbursing officers' accounts of payments made to Reserve officers promoted while on active duty;

S. 3737. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire by donation land at or near Newburgh, in Orange County, N. Y., for aviation field, military, or other public purposes;

S. 3747. An act for the relief of Maizee Hamley;

S. 3748. An act to authorize the Bureau of Mines to conduct certain studies, investigations, and experiments with respect to sub-bituminous and lignite coal, and for other purposes;

S. 3769. An act for the relief of Marcellus E. Wright and Lee, Smith & Vandervoort, Inc.;

S. 3797. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes", approved May 26, 1920;

S. 3859. An act to authorize the procurement, without advertising, of certain War Department property, and for other purposes;

S. 3932. An act for the relief of Ann Rakestraw;

S. 3950. An act to aid in defraying the expenses of the Sixteenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1937;

S. 3977. An act to authorize the Washington Gas Light Co. to alter its corporate structure, and for other purposes;

S. 4135. An act for the relief of Helen Curtis;

S. 4214. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Sabine and Neches Rivers with a view to controlling their

floods and regulating, conserving, and utilizing the waters thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 4416. An act for the relief of Josephine Russell; and

S. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Swedes in Delaware.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Couzens	La Follette	Robinson
Ashurst	Davis	Lewis	Russell
Austin	Dieterich	Logan	Schwellenbach
Bachman	Donahey	Loneragan	Sheppard
Bailey	Duffy	McAdoo	Shipstead
Barbour	Frazier	McGill	Smith
Barkley	George	McKellar	Steiwer
Benson	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Guffey	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Moore	Tydings
Byrd	Harrison	Murphy	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hastings	Murray	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	Overton	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Pittman	White
Clark	Johnson	Pope	
Connally	Keyes	Radcliffe	
Coolidge	King	Reynolds	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mrs. LONG], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained from the Senate by official business. I ask that the announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RANDALL KRAUSS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, there is on the desk a message from the other House in respect to Senate bill 3839. I ask the Chair to lay the action of the House before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3839) granting a pension to Randall Krauss, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Randall Krauss, a minor, of Yakima, Wash., the sum of \$60 per month until he attains the age of 21, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for the death of his father, mother, and sister, who were killed when struck by a United States Army airplane which crashed at Griffith Park, Calif., on June 20, 1935: *Provided*, That payments hereunder shall begin on the first calendar day of the month following the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary

notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Randall Krauss, a minor."

Mr. JOHNSON. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WALSH presented the memorial of Acushnet Grange, No. 285, of Acushnet, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Pettengill bill, being the bill (H. R. 3263) to amend paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended February 28, 1920 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Worcester County Christian Endeavor Union and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Holliston, both in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to include not only the elimination of unfair trade practices in the motion-picture industry but also higher moral standards of production, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions and letters in the nature of petitions from Boston Terminal Lodge, No. 1089, B. R. C., of Boston; Bunker Hill Lodge, No. 1099, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, of Somerville; Railroad Lodge, No. 487, International Association of Machinists, of Springfield; Division No. 571, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of West Springfield; E. A. Smith Division, No. 146, Order of Railway Conductors, of Fitchburg, and sundry citizens, being railroad workers, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 4174) to foster and protect interstate commerce by authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve or disapprove of the consolidation or abandonment of carrier facilities of public service, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from Local Union No. 799, International Longshoremen's Association, of Boston, and Local Union No. 42, Chauffeurs', Teamsters', and Helpers' Union, of Lynn, both in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation amending the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workmen's Compensation Act, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC SUGARBEET AND SUGARCANE PRODUCERS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Mr. Chester H. Gray, Washington representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and a telegram signed by Hon. Richard W. Leche, Governor-elect of Louisiana, and Hon. Allen J. Ellender, Senator-elect from Louisiana. The communications have to do with proposed legislation designed for the protection of domestic producers of sugarbeets and sugarcane, which is of vital importance to such producers.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1936.

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR OVERTON: I have examined your measure, S. 4560, a measure to protect domestic producers of sugarbeets and sugarcane, and find it very much in accord with Farm Bureau policies.

This is a very satisfactory measure, as are the two measures of Congressman KNIFFIN, of Ohio, recently introduced. We seem now to be approaching a time, after considerable experimentation on the sugar question, in which we are getting back to the sound principle of having no quotas on domestic sugar. Whatever quotas may be necessary should be applied exclusively to off-shore products, and such quotas should be variable from year to year so as

to admit into continental United States only those amounts of cane and beet sugar which domestic producers do not supply.

It may be reasonably stated that the policy of the last 2 years in regard to sugar has been one which adequately has protected American investments in Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines. It cannot be denied, also, that cane and beet producers in continental United States during the last 2 years have made more money, owing to the benefit payments, but they have made that money on the unsound basis of surrendering three-fourths of the great American sugar-consuming market to the foreigners. Such a solution of the domestic farm problem cannot be tolerated as a permanent proposition. The bills now under consideration by yourself and Congressman KNIFFIN should receive the support of all who believe in expanding production of a crop like sugar, which is capable of great expansion, and when expanded, will serve, among other purposes, the useful function of reducing production in other staple crops.

It is hoped that your measure and its companion bill before the House can be immediately considered before proper committees of the House and Senate.

Please feel free to command me in any way in which the Farm Bureau Federation can help in presenting the merits of the measure.

Very respectfully,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
CHESTER H. GRAY,
Washington Representative.

BATON ROUGE, LA., May 7, 1936.

United States Senator JOHN H. OVERTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Representatives of the American Sugar Cane League, which comprises 9,000 cane growers of Louisiana, have had a conference with us today, and we are convinced that their plight under the 220,000 quota for Louisiana sugar production prescribed in S. 4413, now being discussed in Congress, is extremely serious. The quota offered Louisiana is not only 100,000 tons less than actually produced last year, but it is less by considerably more than 100,000 tons than the average production of the State in the 1909-14 period, which was 350,000 tons, and that is the period the Government uses as its yardstick of parity in fixing the farmers' purchasing power. In the division of quotas among all the sugar areas based upon 1909-14 parity years the quota given Louisiana flagrantly discriminates against our State, and we must seriously protest such unfair treatment accorded our people. The avowed purpose of the administration has been repeatedly declared by its spokesmen in authority to be to restore the farmers' purchasing power by bringing about a parity between the price he received for his produce and the price he has to pay for the things he has to buy. The principle of parity income is obviously defeated if he is not allowed to raise the complete crop produced during the 1909-14 parity period. We trust that you and all the other members of the Louisiana delegation in the Senate and House will vote against the Harrison-Costigan sugar bill, now known as S. 4413, unless the quota provision is so amended as to give Louisiana a quota of 450,000 tons, which is the minimum necessary for the survival of one of Louisiana's most important industries. Please introduce and fight for amendment to this effect. If unsuccessful on amendment, please use every effort to kill this discriminatory legislation. Please convey to the President and the Secretary of Agriculture our serious protest against such unfair legislation as is proposed.

RICHARD W. LECHÉ, Governor-elect of Louisiana.
ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator-elect.

CONSERVATIVE AMERICA

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and to lie on the table an editorial from the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of April 27, 1936, the leading newspaper of the State of Montana, entitled "Conservative America."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of Apr. 27, 1936]

CONSERVATIVE AMERICA

Alarmists wailing over radical innovations in the United States, whenever any change is proposed in the customary methods of government, only bear out the truth of a statement made by Senator WHEELER in an interview in St. Paul recently. The Senator declared the United States has the most conservative government on earth today, by which he meant "one which has upset accustomed procedure and policy to a lesser extent than any other in the world."

It is a peculiar trait in Americans that they are radical in some matters and concern is expressed by very few national leaders over that form of radical innovation, but if the slightest change is proposed in political set-up or policy, there is an immediate outpouring of vehement protests from high quarters.

In business and industrial affairs we have been going through a period of the most fundamental changes, and the man who expresses fear at that process is scoffed at as ignorant of sound

economics. Great industrial organizations closely linked to or controlled by tremendous financial institutions, rapid development of the chain system of business, growth of the holding company system, development of a management interest in great corporations disassociated from ownership of the property by powerless scattered stockholders, are all radical changes in our American life whose ultimate effects we cannot foresee clearly and which certainly raise serious questions. Regimentation of the individual by the State, which is pictured as a serious menace by conservative leaders, is relatively insignificant beside the economic regimentation to which the common individual is subjected by great business organizations, and yet that is passed over as a natural condition.

In our adoption of mechanical devices and industrial processes we have been bold and unhesitating, scrapping whole industries, tremendously changing the lives of great groups of people, and remodeling the environment in which we all live without any attempt to measure the ultimate effects of radical changes of this nature on society.

But if the slightest change is proposed in a rule of government, the least restriction on a court power, or the most obvious alteration in customary political procedure, eminent gentlemen, who are enjoying great advantages, cry darkly about "Moscow" and radicalism. And many humble people, who do not have a very clear idea of what the issue is, take up the cry because of their habitual conservatism in matters political.

Policies that other countries will adopt as a matter of course to meet some immediate need send us into spasms of discussion and the old ghost of radicalism is trotted out to scare the voters away from the innovation.

Our cosmopolitan population, with diverse racial strains and origins; our many sections, with conflicting economic interests; and our Federal system, with its division of responsibility, which is difficult to adapt to new industrial and scientific developments, are some of the reasons for that political conservatism which marks us as a nation. Our political system has remained without fundamental alteration for a longer period now than that of almost any great power.

To recognize this trait is not necessarily to criticize it, but that recognition does point out the proper direction for our concern. It is not innovation in government that is our most constant danger, but the undirected and rapid changes in industrial and business methods.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9009) to make lands in drainage, irrigation, and conservancy districts eligible for loans by the Federal land banks and other Federal agencies loaning on farm lands, notwithstanding the existence of prior liens of assessments made by such districts, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2008) thereon.

Mr. BARBOUR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9042) to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Supply Base to the city of Newark, N. J., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2009) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3921. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn (Rept. No. 2014); and

S. 4425. A bill to relinquish all right, title, and interest of the United States in certain lands in the State of Connecticut (Rept. No. 2010).

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4078) to authorize the award of the Distinguished Service Cross to John C. Reynolds, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2011) thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9496) to protect the United States against loss in the delivery through the mails of checks in payment of benefits provided for by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2012) thereon.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 4558) for the relief of Gladys Hinckley Werlich, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2013) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE:

A bill (S. 4608) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of York County, Maine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A bill (S. 4609) to correct the description of certain land granted to the University of Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENSON:

A bill (S. 4610) to make it a criminal offense to disseminate false information designed to incite participation by the United States in foreign wars; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BENSON also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 263, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4611) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4612) extending the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act to Guy Lester Brotherson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 4613) for the relief of Bell Oil & Gas Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8234) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of a heroic Pioneer Memorial was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I move a reconsideration of the action of the Senate in discharging the Committee on Banking and Currency from the further consideration of Senate bill 4511 to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the incorporation of credit unions within the District of Columbia", approved June 23, 1932, and the bill (S. 4512) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, and referring them to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Those bills were introduced by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and properly referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, because they relate to banking matters.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was advised by the clerk and others that the bills properly belonged in the District Committee. I made no investigation and assumed that they were properly referred to that committee.

Mr. GLASS. They were properly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, the chairman of which committee is now ill at his home, and it is at his request, and in conformity with my own judgment, that I ask that the action be reconsidered and that the bills be returned to the Committee on Banking and Currency where we are now conducting hearings on them.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to that action being taken.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the motion of the Senator from Virginia that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of the bills referred to by him and that they be rereferred to the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I now understand the parliamentary situation. I could not hear the request of the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There were two bills introduced and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as the Chair understands. Subsequently the Committee on

Banking and Currency was discharged from their further consideration, and they were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. The Senator from Virginia now asks that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from their further consideration and that they be referred again to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bills are referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12395) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REGULATION OF ELECTIONS IN PUERTO RICO—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4528) to regulate the conduct of elections in Puerto Rico, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. OVERTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12624, the first deficiency bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Payments for agricultural adjustment: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet all obligations and commitments under the Louisiana sugarcane administrative ruling no. 6, exclusive of subparagraph (d) thereof, pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, \$1,231,000.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS PURSUANT TO ACT OF JULY 1, 1932 (S. DOC. NO. 207)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, under the act of July 1, 1932, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make report to Congress relative to the adjustment or elimination of reimbursable charges of the Government existing as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, cancellations, and so forth, mostly on irrigation districts in the southwestern portion of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the report submitted on December 1, 1934, be printed as a Senate document, as has been customary heretofore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed as a Senate document.

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 248) to provide for participation by the United States in an inter-American conference to be held at Buenos Aires, Argentina, or at the capital of another American republic, in 1936, which was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "conference", to insert "in pursuance of and for the purposes set forth in a letter from the President of the United States dated January 30, 1936."

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

FEDERAL RECLAMATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HATCH

Mr. MCGILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an able and interesting address delivered by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] before the Rivers and Harbors Congress at its recent meeting in the city of Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Much has been said and much will be said during the progress of your meeting, I am sure, about the problems of conservation, the evils which have resulted from the exploitations of our lands and natural resources. Events of the past 3 years, droughts, dust storms in the West, tornadoes in the South, and floods and

disaster in the East, have brought these subjects to our attention in a most striking manner. The people of the Nation are awake today to these problems as they have never been before. You gentlemen of the Rivers and Harbors Congress have long been aware of the various aspects of the entire situation.

I do not come from a country which is supposed to have floods, nor do the rivers of my State present any great problems of navigation. Seagoing vessels, merchant ships, or armored fleets rarely visit the ports of Albuquerque or Santa Fe. But yet, even in our semi-arid regions, floods are not unknown, and entirely too frequently waste and destruction of crops and lands result from disastrous floods. Lives have been lost in the flood waters of New Mexico, and the waters from my own State do contribute, as many of you know, to the serious problems of streams and rivers of other States. But it is not of floods nor of primary problems of rivers and harbors I shall speak today, although floods, excess waters and regulation thereof are a part of the general problem of reclamation and irrigation.

It happens, all my life has been spent in regions which have been affected by a lack of water, by droughts and windstorms. As a small boy, I recall the hot winds which destroyed corn and wheat and products of the farm within a few short days. In later years, in another State where I grew to maturity, I have seen vast fields of cotton wilt, wither, and die because the rains came not and the hot winds blew. I have seen men and women struggle year after year against the adversity of climatic conditions, of insufficient rainfall in sections of the country where the annual precipitation was sufficient to have raised ample crops, but the rains did not come at the right time and seasons of the year.

In my own State of New Mexico, where I have resided many years, I have seen the sand and dust and the dry winds do all the things which bring disaster and ruin to an earnest, industrious, and intelligent people trying to make their own way, trying to be independent and seeking to live by their own efforts, as American citizens should live. In addition to all this, I have seen land itself practically destroyed. I know of farms in various parts of the country, which 20 or 25 years ago were rich, fertile farms, but which today do not produce enough to pay the taxes.

Therefore, when I speak of reclamation, I speak not from an academic standpoint of one who has read and considered the ill effects of dry winds and lack of moisture, but I speak of these things with the voice of one who knows whereof he speaks from personal observation and actual experience. When I say to you that the waters of my State, in certain sections, go uncontrolled, down mountain side, over valley lands into streams and rivers, impoverishing the soil over which they flow, and destroying other lands below, when at the same time that water, by proper control, conservation, and impounding, could be applied to the growing of useful crops, to the prevention of the hardship of insufficient rainfall, and to the building of independent, self-supporting, honest citizenry, I speak exactly what is true, and I speak with vigor and earnestness about it, because to my mind, there has long been a misconception and a misunderstanding of reclamation, its purposes, its ends, and its accomplishments.

In the past, many people unfamiliar with actual conditions have viewed reclamation from a standpoint which is entirely incorrect. They have thought of it as a local issue, beneficial only to the community where the project is located. Some have been so blind or so unkind as to think of it in terms of pork-barrel politics. Some have even thought of reclamation projects as a form of waste and extravagant use of Federal funds in aid and assistance to communities whose citizens would better return to labor in shop and factory. With those who so believe, I am, of course, in sharp disagreement. The waste and extravagance have not been in the storage and impounding of our excess waters, and the application of such waters to practical and beneficial use, but the waste has been these many years in permitting those excess waters to escape and run wild and rampant throughout the country, laying low, wasting and destroying valuable crops, food supplies, property, and even human beings. Here lies extravagance.

I believe in reclamation as a national policy; it is not only of local interest. The preservation of lands, the conservation of our water, the control and regulation of our rivers, are things which constitute the life and blood of America. In that program, reclamation plays a most important part; it walks hand in hand with all efforts for soil conservation and for the regulation and control of the stream system of the country.

When you have builded dams and reservoirs, such for instance as are located at Elephant Butte or Carlsbad, N. Mex., and have made thousands of acres of dry land fertile, crop-producing lands, you have not only conserved excess waters, but you have made it possible to establish a community of thousands of American citizens, prosperous, happy, and contented; you have removed the fear of drought, flood, and disaster; you have builded, in every way, not only for today but for the years to come. Further, the activities under the Federal reclamation policy create an endless chain of benefits to the Nation as a whole. Direct benefits occur in the arid and semiarid region which covers one-third of the United States. Indirect benefits, in the form of taxes and the creation of purchasing power, affect every State in the Union. It might be surprising to you to know it is estimated that about one-half of all funds for construction of irrigation structures goes to industry for the purchase of material and supplies, and that for every man engaged on the job 1.8 persons are given indirect employment. Funds spent on Federal

reclamation have, therefore, been a major factor in relieving unemployment, both at the site of construction and in the industrial centers of the East.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION MAJOR CONSERVATION UNIT

Federal reclamation as a national policy is now 34 years old. It is an important factor in the Federal Government's conservation program, accomplishing as it does the control of floods, improvement of navigation to meet the needs of irrigated agriculture, domestic requirements of cities and towns, and the generation of hydroelectric power as an adjunct of irrigation development. The Federal reclamation policy was adopted by Congress in 1902 only after it was demonstrated that larger and costlier works for conservation of the unregulated flow of western rivers for irrigation purposes could not be constructed from private funds.

NEED SPURS ACTIVITY

Great impetus has been given to the construction program of the Bureau of Reclamation by the generous allotment of emergency funds and the money so allotted during the past 2 years nearly equals the amount set aside by Congress in 30 years. Twenty-one dams have been completed or started with such funds since 1933, in comparison to 125 dams constructed during the 30-year period. It may thus be seen that the interests of the West are being given sympathetic aid by the Federal Government to carry out a program of conservation most vital to the West.

IRRIGATED AGRICULTURE CREATES OPPORTUNITIES FOR HOMES

Every farmer settled with his family on a Federal reclamation project is tendered the means under provisions of good soil and a regulated flow of water to go about the business of irrigated agriculture as a livelihood for his family. As I have before pointed out, this means economic independence—that security of which so much is said today. I am one of those who believe that many of our economic problems today arise from an unwise congestion of human beings in cities and towns of the land.

A large part of our population is altogether dependent upon the fruits of daily wages from industry and business, and susceptible to all the ills and evils which arise from wide fluctuation of business and industrial activity. The problem of unemployment constantly menaces not only the happiness and well-being of the individuals so living and so dependent, but it constitutes a menace to the welfare of the country itself. Men were never designed to live in crowded, congested, unhealthy, unsightly, and disagreeable tenement and slum districts like ants in a heap or bees in a hive. Man is essentially a creature dependent upon the land; from it he came, to it he returns. Between the Alpha and Omega of his existence, all his life, his wealth, prosperity, and happiness depend upon the earth.

If we can so extend our agricultural program so that thousands and millions of our citizens can return to the soil and farm under a regulated program of the West, a large portion and part of our present perplexing, yes, some say terrifying, problem of unemployment will be solved in a way that will bring not only independence and happiness to the individual, but will add material wealth to America.

RECLAMATION, A GOOD FEDERAL INVESTMENT

No other policy of the Government has added more to national prosperity than the Federal Reclamation projects. The benefits are endless. During construction, they put people to work at the site. The purchasing of materials and supplies helps to keep the factories of the East going, thereby supporting the families depending on work in these fields. The settlement that follows irrigation development takes care of families on the land, creates purchasing power, and brings into the treasury of county and State governments such needed revenue in the form of taxes. The National Government also is a beneficiary by income tax, inheritance tax, and Federal taxation on purchases. Everyone receiving a part of the appropriation made for construction, whether it be in the form of wages or payment for materials and supplies, keeps the money moving to the best possible advantage, and best of all, dwindles the line of the unemployed and helps business to help itself.

RECLAMATION FUNDS REIMBURSABLE

Money spent on Federal reclamation projects is covered by contract with the water users benefited for repayment of the cost over a period of years. The maximum permissible under the law is 40 years, but in some cases repayment of cost is aided by application of power revenues created by Federal development. The repayment record is an enviable one. Of the amounts that have become due the Government, 98.9 percent have been repaid.

WHAT ABOUT FEDERAL RECLAMATION ADDING TO THE SURPLUS?

There is a widespread misconception that Federal reclamation contributes to the agricultural surplus and should be curtailed until such time as the demand increases. Informed people know that this is a mistake. The greater part of the crops grown on these lands are noncompetitive. Long-staple cotton, the products of the orchards, sugar beets, and our winter gardens of the Southwest are all outstanding examples of the noncompetitive character of irrigated lands. Do you realize that because of favorable climatic conditions, soil, and water, the delicacies enjoyed in New York, for instance, during the winter months, come from these favorite spots? They are noncompetitive because they cannot be grown elsewhere except at prohibitive cost. The steadily growing population of western cities is absorbing the increasing products of the irrigated territory.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IRRIGATED AGRICULTURE ARE LIMITED

Let me make this surprising statement—that there are few opportunities left for good storage sites on western rivers to serve good, fertile soil under them. Probably the largest remaining compact body of land which can be economically irrigated with a plentiful water supply is the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington, where 1,200,000 acres of fertile soil are awaiting water for irrigation from the storage created by Grand Coulee Dam.

I have but hurriedly mentioned some of the outstanding features concerning Federal reclamation, but I must say this program of reclamation and of irrigation, of soil conservation, of wise and expedient protecting and safeguarding of the natural resources, of which mother nature has so richly and bountifully endowed us, is to my mind, one of the most, if not the most important contribution we of this generation are making to the welfare of America as a whole, and I must reiterate and declare that it is a program which must be carried on and must be further developed and expanded. We of today have no right to waste, neglect, and destroy the land and thereby impoverish and pauperize the generations which are to follow us. The richness of our lands, the fertility of our soil, the protection and regulation of our streams mean the protection, the development, and enrichment of America and American citizens for all time to come. Reclamation has its share, its contribution, and its part in this great national program.

Again, and in conclusion, may I stress that while reclamation has been considered almost altogether in connection with the West, this idea is entirely erroneous. Reclamation and its program dovetail exactly into the general plan of conservation of both land and water. Problems of river and stream regulation and control, from the Mississippi and all its vast region to its smallest tributary, including the prevention of devastating floods east and west of that mighty stream, and the building and developing of great reclamation and irrigation projects from the far reaches of the Pacific and the great Northwest, and all the arid and semi-arid districts, constitute, in reality, but one program, all linked together and all a part of the general plan for the conservation of land, water, property, and even human lives. I repeat, it is not local; it is national in scope, character, and effect.

INCREASING EMPLOYMENT AND PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ROPER

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Secretary Roper, of the Department of Commerce, before the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, on April 28, 1936, on the subject "Increasing Employment and Production."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President and members of the United States Chamber of Commerce, it is a pleasure for me to meet with the members of the United States Chamber of Commerce at your twenty-fourth annual meeting. In the 3 years which have passed since I last addressed you the people of the United States have passed through one of the most challenging periods in our economic and social history.

When I met with you on May 5, 1933, the country was beginning the long and gradual climb from the depths of the depression which had begun with the financial collapse in 1929.

The status of conditions at that time was well and forcefully expressed by Mr. Henry I. Harriman, then president of your organization, in his testimony before a congressional committee in May 1933. He said:

"We have seen the national income fall from \$84,000,000,000 in 1929 to approximately \$40,000,000,000 last year (1932), and if the decline were to continue uninterrupted at the same rate during the present year (1933), the national income would not be over \$30,000,000,000. That is a most appalling situation and it indicates that remedies which in normal conditions we would look at with great hesitation we can well consider in times like these."

"I believe that the exigency which faces the country is far greater than the emergency of the war, and that the damage resulting from 4 years of depression to our people is much greater than the damage that came in the years that we were in the World War."

For more than 3 years the people had been waiting for the depression forces to run their course. Yet, the situation grew cumulatively worse. More and more people were being forced out of work; bank suspensions had been increasing at an alarming rate; farm and home mortgage foreclosures were rising; business activity continued to decline; profits were replaced by deficits; and the hope and confidence of the people were undermined. As long as these conditions continued there could have been no solid basis for recovery.

By March 1933 so many employees had been eliminated from the pay rolls of private industry that private charities, municipalities, and States were confronted with a relief burden which, in many instances, they were absolutely unable to meet. A recently published survey by a nationally known non-Government organization shows that the percentage of tax delinquencies in 190 cities of over 50,000 population was two and one-half times greater in 1933 than in 1930. From these concrete figures it is

easy to understand why the larger cities where the unemployment problem was most acute were forced to turn to the National Government for aid. Tax delinquencies in the smaller cities were often far more drastic than in the larger cities. Also in many States there were legal restrictions to prevent increased bond issues for necessary unemployment expenditures.

As the depression deepened private business could not draw further on reserves to maintain employment in the face of decreasing markets and purchasing power. It was necessary for the Federal Government to assume the responsibility of halting the economic and social-erosion processes and of building a foundation upon which gradual and sound recovery could be based.

ALTERNATIVES FOR ACTION

The Nation in March 1933 had two alternatives. The deflation forces could have been permitted to run their full course until costs and prices had been brought into balance at some low level or sound, constructive action could be taken to halt the downward spiral and restore the proper balance during the progress of recovery. To have allowed the process of complete liquidation to run its course, after which the country once more might have begun an upward trend toward another high peak of prosperity would have meant an unbearable burden of want and suffering. We were dealing with the human factor as well as the economic. There were millions of unemployed and an increasing social unrest. Our country could not have withstood the shock of any further liquidation or deflation at that time. The destruction of the people's confidence in their economic system, and in their Government was in itself a far more serious challenge than financial deflation.

Today, in retrospect we may easily say what should have been done that was not done; what should have been done differently; and what should not have been done, but we cannot deny the fact that the action taken was necessary to halt the depression and to provide a basis and impetus for sustained economic progress. Furthermore, your Government has taken corrective steps to eliminate or minimize those elements in our system which tend to aggravate and deepen such cycles of depression.

RECOVERY RESULTS

Today, in place of the thousands of business failures, the millions of dollars of financial losses in form of profits, and the vast amount of local and State tax delinquencies in 1932 and 1933, business profits have returned in substantial volume, tax collections have improved, production and distribution of goods have increased with a consequent employment gain. The credit of the Government was used to bolster private, local, and State financial structures. Through loans to business and industry, benefit payments to farmers, and the placing of millions of dollars in circulation through work-relief payments production activities were continued, buying power was expanded, and business profits were made possible for private enterprise.

The striking economic improvements that have taken place since I last addressed you in the spring of 1933 are reflected in the following figures: Industrial production has increased 42 percent; factory employment has gained 41 percent; factory pay rolls have risen 95 percent; cash income from farm marketings, exclusive of benefit payments, has increased 45 percent; department-store sales have risen 38 percent; freight-car loadings have increased 25 percent; stock prices (421 companies) have risen 129 percent; the total value of foreign trade has increased 104 percent; construction contracts awarded have advanced 236 percent. One of the most indicative measurements of the improved economic conditions of the Nation is the increase in the national income. It is estimated that the national income produced increased by approximately \$15,000,000,000, or more than one-third from 1932 to 1935.

In 1932 business enterprises of the Nation paid out \$9,000,000,000 more than they produced. Obviously, this condition represented a barrier to expansion in an economy where the profit motive is such an important basic factor. Today, for the first time in 6 years, business enterprise as a whole is maintaining current operations and paying dividends without drawing upon capital or other resources to make up for deficits. The rising trend of our national income, therefore, not only reflects the marked improvements which have taken place but also reveals that there is a sounder basis for further economic gains. During this period there has been a real gain in reemployment. It has been estimated that the average number employed during the first 3 months of 1936 was $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions more than the average for the first quarter of 1933. Notwithstanding this improvement, unemployment and relief constitute the major economic and social problem confronting business and Government.

THE REEMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY OF BUSINESS

It is fitting, therefore, that you have chosen for discussion at this meeting the question of how business can increase employment and production. A fundamental consideration of this discussion must be how private enterprise can put more people to work. There can be no escape from this, for if it is not the responsibility of private enterprise to employ the millions of people now out of work, then it becomes the responsibility of private charity, and of local, State, and the National Government to care for them until gainful work is secured. Many industries are to be complimented upon the gains which have been registered, and the advantage which has been taken of the improved economic and social conditions to carry forward constructive pro-

grams. Today in some industries there are more people employed than before the depression and further gains are constantly being made. But our efforts must be increased upon all fronts through cooperative study and action. Even though one industry may show highly encouraging gains the sound position of that industry is not assured until national unemployment has been greatly reduced.

There is no greater assurance for successful and profitable operations in the future, and, thus, for decreased governmental expenditures, than the employment of labor. Therefore, it is the responsibility of all business and industrial enterprise, and not of one particular segment or of the Government, to increase its efforts for greater employment. If a substantial measure of increased reemployment does not take place the taxation for relief purposes will come largely from business earnings. Thus, facing the problem frankly, there must be reemployment or a longer period of increased taxation.

RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS

We cannot develop a long-term approach to the entire problem of unemployment properly and realistically in the light of present-day conditions and trends without more specific and dependable knowledge about the nature, scope, and intricacies of unemployment. But I believe that a mere "head count" of the totals represents only a small part of the problem. We must know more about the specific causes behind the situation; in what segments of our economic activity the major part of the unemployment problem falls; what percentage of the total are unemployable because of disability, physical, mental, or moral; what is the distribution of those who are properly employable but now unemployed among the different occupations; the nature and scope of the problem created by new employables who have never been gainfully employed; in what fields are there prospective skilled and unskilled labor shortages; and what the ultimate relationship between all segments of our economic life properly should be when the satisfactory solution is found.

The Department of Commerce is now securing a great deal of valuable data concerning employment as well as some aspects of unemployment through the Census of Business and Census of Manufactures, which are now being taken concurrently. As soon as these censuses are completed we shall then know how much and what type of supplementary and additional data are required to give an adequate and intelligible picture of employment and unemployment. As soon as this information is available steps should be taken immediately to secure this additional needed data and to that end I propose at that time an occupational and unemployment census.

I believe that it is the responsibility of business to take stock of its employment assets as well as its unemployment liabilities. Constructive and aggressive reemployment must not and should not have to await the taking of a full, technical census. Business should survey its own needs and its own conditions from the viewpoint of employing as many persons as current improvements and future programs demand. In this manner a concrete picture of employment potentialities will be secured, immediate employment for those not now on pay rolls will be found and a proper and necessary basis for future employment and production adjustments will be provided.

THE PROBLEM OF TECHNOLOGICAL UNEMPLOYMENT

During the past 25 years we have increased our productive efficiency to such an extent that the number of workers employed in the physical production of goods increased only approximately 6 percent while the number engaged in producing services increased approximately 66 percent. As we have become more efficient in our production facilities, more of our energies have been utilized in satisfying other needs. One of the fundamental reasons for the great progress which we have made in raising our standards of living has been our ability to develop more efficient methods of production. This has been made possible through technological development based upon years of research and study.

Our problem today is not to restrain nor destroy the ability to increase productive efficiency or to produce upon a large-scale basis, but rather it is a question of how we can properly utilize these national attributes for providing further opportunities for gainful employment and lower costs to the consumer, without recourse to wage reductions or lengthened hours of employment. I believe that business should give further study to this question of technological development to determine what the labor displacement is, and how the workers can be more quickly transferred to other productive channels.

It is a responsibility of business to speed up this transition period so that men thrown out of work by technological innovations may more rapidly than at present be transferred into new fields. To this end, I suggest that each major industry, through proper mechanisms and as a part of the survey I have suggested, set up what may for descriptive purposes be called "technological unemployment committees." Such committees would study and review reports from all members of the industry, setting forth on a confidential basis, if necessary, the probable replacement of employees through new machinery installations. With such information available, considerably in advance of resultant employee reductions, early efforts could be made to translate these employees into other work.

OPPORTUNITIES IN THE DURABLE GOODS FIELD

We know that during the past 5 or 6 years industry has withdrawn from production much of its old equipment, with the

result that further increased production on an efficient basis will require new capital replacements. Today inventories are low, outworn and outmoded machinery needs to be replaced, buildings as well as equipment need repairing and new construction can well be undertaken. Thus, there has accumulated a need for new agricultural and industrial machinery, for railroad and electrical equipment and for new construction in excess of normal replacement requirements.

Upon the basis of the concrete and realistic recovery which has taken place there is a sound foundation for increasing capital expenditures and replacing obsolete equipment. If production efficiency is to be maintained and increased, these deferred demands must be fulfilled. A further permeation of recovery into the durable goods field is essential for a more complete consolidation of economic gains and consequent large-scale employment.

I believe that one of the outstanding opportunities which private enterprise, with Government cooperation, can meet today is that of a well-founded and wisely guided home-building program, based not only upon the immediate demands but also upon a long-term need. A program of this nature will not only furnish significant impetus for further recovery through increased economic activity but will establish a basis upon which enlarged economic and social security and independence will be brought to millions of our people. The type of program which must be initiated is reflected in the market which must be provided for the millions of people in the lower-income groups. This illustrates the vast potential economic and social possibilities existing in this field in the United States of which immediate advantage can be taken. We need to utilize our vast resources, our research facilities, and our productive equipment to enter the field of mass production of homes in order that this lower-income group may be properly and adequately housed.

As this program is initiated especial emphasis should be placed on utilizing local facilities for local building programs. For example, local financing, at proper interest rates, should be used whenever possible. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of business to see that this program is soundly developed and wisely guided so that there is not a sudden speculative boom period, followed by an early return to depressed and deflated building and real-estate conditions.

REEMPLOYMENT THROUGH FOREIGN TRADE

Another aspect of our national economy which should receive more careful attention by business with reference to reemployment is that of foreign trade. We know that millions of our people are either directly or indirectly dependent upon foreign trade for their livelihood.

It is significant to note that from 1929 to 1933, the period of decline in domestic business activity, foreign trade of the United States decreased from nine and one-half billion dollars in 1929 to less than \$3,000,000,000 in 1933. Since 1933, when sustained economic recovery began, foreign commerce as a correlative and contributing factor has been increasing. In 1935 our total foreign trade, on a value basis, totaled more than \$4,000,000,000. To sustain a well-balanced recovery, an increased volume of trade with other countries is essential.

Through its reciprocal trade agreement program, the present administration has taken direct and constructive action to readjust the destructive foreign-trade barriers which contributed to the decline of domestic business activity. With the trade channels with other nations now being opened upon a reciprocal basis, business and industry have new opportunities for markets in foreign countries. It is the responsibility of business and industry to take advantage of these opportunities for increased production and increased employment.

BUSINESS PLANNING FOR PUBLIC WORKS

I believe that business, in cooperation with communities, States, and the National Government, should give careful study to the development of a broad useful public-works program which would serve as a reservoir for employment in periods of depression. If such a well-developed program had been available at the beginning of the last depression period, a channel would have existed into which those workers who were thrown out of employment could have been placed without delay. Much constructive work could be accomplished in conserving and rebuilding our natural resources, in developing parks, water fronts, and making other public improvements which add materially to our national wealth and progress. The success of such a program would depend primarily upon planning ahead of time so that when conditions demanded it the program would be put into immediate operation by localities and States whenever any large measure of unemployment threatens business stability. Even under the hurriedly constructed program of the past 3 years, we have found that public works do provide a reservoir of employment and serve to stimulate private enterprise toward sound recovery. I believe that any such public-works program, to succeed, must have the cooperation of business and industry. Therefore, business should, through its properly constituted organizations, begin immediate research studies concerning long-term and long-range public works.

One of the dominant elements of success in American business and industry has been the trend toward higher wages and lower costs. It is obvious that hours and wages should differ according to industries. Business has never analyzed fully what the economically proper and sound working hours and wages should be. We know that in certain industries, for example, costs of production

have decreased while wages paid have increased and hours of labor declined. But business has not approached this question from a standpoint of national economic conditions to determine the exact relationship between production, wages, and hours. Each industry should give careful study to the question of how improvements in productive operations will result in lower prices, increased consumption, and hence additional employment. It is the responsibility of business to formulate definite and concrete programs that will assure the most effective results in the maintenance of proper wages and hours.

Prompt and vigorous action in this connection will serve to decrease bureaucracy in the National Government that comes from carrying responsibility which should be reassumed now by business, other private organizations, States, and localities. The best way to take bureaucracy out of government is to place more responsibility on nongovernmental agencies.

THE CHALLENGE OF "DEFEATISM"

While it is true that during the emergency period the Federal Government assumed many of the responsibilities of individuals, industries, and municipal and State governments, it does not mean that these responsibilities properly belong to the Federal Government. The release of these obligations during the depression has led to an attitude on the part of these units that they can or should no longer have to bear these proper responsibilities. This attitude of "defeatism" must be replaced with the attitude that it is the duty of individuals, industries, and local and state governments to resume these obligations as rapidly as possible. If this approach is accepted in spirit and translated into action, Government expenditures will decline and bureaucracy will decrease.

Recently a businessman was heard to say: "I'm too busy, working every day of the week, including Sunday, keeping my own fences in order, to give any time to these national problems." Another businessman spoke up and said: "If all of us businessmen feel and act that way, we soon may not have any fences to keep in order." That illustrates an attitude that I find too prevalent among businessmen. They have come to the conviction that as long as they take care of their own affairs then by some mysterious process their interrelationships will be taken care of automatically. Yes; we need straight thinking, as a distinguished member of this organization has said, but we must think comprehensively and sympathetically in order to think straight. Today, with large amounts of fixed capital in use, with centralized organizations controlling a large portion of business enterprise, and with a complicated interdependence throughout industry, more coordinated planning by business is essential.

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS

There has never been a greater need for a mutual understanding between Government and business than there is today. The attainment of this objective should be a distinctly crystallized endeavor on the part of both. Early in 1933 I felt the need of a constructive approach of this nature and recommended the formation of the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce. In the formation and in the functioning of this council the method is just as important as the results. In the interrelationships between Government and business, attitudes are just as important as actions. If such a council had been formed 15 years ago and had functioned continuously up to the present time, I am certain that many of the misinterpretations that have grown out of the depression and emergency period would never have existed. The council, through its many reports and studies and its continuity of contacts with the Department of Commerce and other Government agencies, has had a splendid opportunity to register the business viewpoint while becoming familiar with the problems and processes of the Federal Government. I urge that business take advantage of every opportunity to bring about a further extension of this thoroughly democratic principle.

A letter received recently from a leading manufacturer contained this significant statement: "Differences of opinion may easily exist as to the best ways to reach our goals, but as to essential goals themselves, few will disagree. These serious questions of our time must be faced with the utmost possible mutual understanding and good will—without political motives, for the problems transcend all political interests or lines—without rancor, for the ills to be healed are of no individual's making—and without bias, for none of us is great or wise enough to have a ready answer to these problems that still challenge the utmost spiritual energy of our Nation." I believe that this statement expresses the proper attitude. When business and Government fail to create and maintain those educational attitudes and endeavors which clarify national problems and establish a mutual working basis for the solution of such problems, the confidence of the general public is weakened and the vital factor of a favorable public opinion is lost. Let us in all cases have constructive and definitive criticism, but let us insist that this criticism be practicable and realistic in the light of changed conditions and the enlarged responsibilities of business.

Certainly, it should be clear to everyone that it is not the desire or purpose of your Government to destroy those fundamental concepts and principles of American business and industry which have made possible our national wealth and progress. These basic principles and objectives have proven sound and constructive down through the years of our national growth and progress. They must and will remain as the ideals by which American business and industry should be guided. But, business must inspire public confidence and justify its belief in these ideals by its actions. The fulfillment of the responsibilities involved in these

fundamental objectives rests with business itself. They can only be fulfilled by the concerted action of business with the support and cooperation of the Government. This assistance and cooperation is promised by your Government. As an educational responsibility, business must translate its ideals into action as a concrete proof that it is vitally concerned with the welfare and security of the people of the Nation.

A 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR BUSINESS

I have endeavored to emphasize the fact that since business enterprise must pay the bills it should submit the plans to cope with the unemployment situation. With this in view I have indicated some of the fields for study as I see them. Let us now summarize these.

1. Business should survey its own needs and its own conditions from the viewpoint of employing as many persons as current improvements and future programs demand.

2. As improvements in productive efficiency are secured, business should pass on to the consumer the benefits of the lower costs of production which result.

3. Business should form and launch industrial committees to study in a comprehensive way technological unemployment and methods for speeding up the transfer into other fields of earning capacity of workers replaced by machines.

4. Business should stimulate the durable-goods industries by early action that will provide for capital goods and machinery replacements due to obsolescence, depreciation, and other causes.

5. Business should develop effective and wisely engineered home-building programs, privately financed and managed and adapted to local needs, to foster better American home standards.

6. Business should launch more aggressive endeavors to expand our foreign trade all along the line and especially in cooperation with the administration's reciprocal trade agreement program.

7. Business should have a research program, conducted by industry and business, for the purpose of informing business on a long-term useful Public Works plan looking to the coordination of proper National, State, local, and private endeavors.

8. Business should make intensive research study of the relationships that should be maintained with respect to production, wages, and hours of labor and the necessary methods and mechanics to be utilized in maintaining this balanced relationship.

9. Business must recognize and apply its best endeavors to a fundamental educational program involving methods and efforts to get the States and subdivisions to reassume their social responsibilities as soon as possible, to study economies in Government, and the prompting of self-respect and mutual responsibility in the individuals and in the groups and organizations of our citizens.

10. Business should utilize every possible channel of approach that will result in the most effective cooperation between business and Government.

It is my firm conviction that as business fulfills these responsibilities employment will increase, relief demands decrease, national income will further expand, and safe and secure recovery will be attained.

THE MARCUS WHITMAN CENTENNIAL

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, during the month of August of this year, the people of the State of Washington will celebrate the centennial anniversary of the coming to our State of Marcus Whitman. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Walla Walla Daily Bulletin on May 1, 1936, discussing the centennial, and its national nature and scope.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Walla Walla (Wash.) Daily Bulletin of May 1, 1936]

CENTENNIAL SCOPE

Dr. S. B. L. Penrose rendered the Whitman Centennial an outstanding service in his address before the Walla Walla Rotary Club Thursday when, in clear, concrete fashion, he sold the idea of this being an event with Nation-wide significance on many counts.

There are many in this community, without doubt, who have failed to view this coming 4-day celebration as something different. There have been anniversaries observed by many communities, and they have consisted of various forms of entertainment, largely with a commercial background.

The Whitman Centennial commemorates several outstanding events, however, and Dr. Penrose made clear that it has significance to the medical profession of the Nation, to the missionary life of America and to the women of our land.

Marcus Whitman, who was a doctor, was the first white man in the United States to come into the Pacific Northwest and practice his profession, being a medical missionary among the Indians of this region. The American Medical Association has so recognized this and is participating in one day's program of the centennial.

Mrs. Whitman, young bride from New York State, was one of two women who were the first American women to journey overland into this region and establish homes. She was the first mother of a white child born in this new homeland.

Dr. and Mrs. Whitman were the first missionaries sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions into the

region to establish an American home and set up a civilization that has grown into a high type in the century since their coming. As Dr. Penrose said, they were not the first missionaries into the Northwest, but their predecessors were unmarried men, and "civilization comes when woman comes to a region."

If any Walla Wallans view the forthcoming celebration, August 13 to 16, as a purely local matter, they may well cast aside such views. The Old Oregon Trail Association of New York City is recognizing the event, the D. A. R., the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the A. A. U. W., and the National Federation of Music Clubs are among other great Nation-wide groups which are making decided contributions to the observance.

The Whitman Centennial is an event of genuine interest in the State that gave us the Whitmans, it is going to be of interest wherever there are people with an appreciation of the pioneer. And that, by the way, will take in a lot of territory, too.

ACTIVITIES AND EXPENDITURES OF RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, it will be recalled that on April 27, at the time when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was pressing his resolution seeking information in connection with A. A. A. benefit payments, among other Senators, I suggested an amendment to that resolution. That amendment was tabled, as is recorded on page 6194 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, the vote to table it being 32 to 30.

On the following day I spoke at some length with respect to my undertakings in this connection and my reasons for them. In the meantime I have accumulated a very considerable amount of additional data in respect to the necessity and justification of seeking information from the Resettlement Administration.

I now ask unanimous consent to have immediately considered a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The resolution is a verbatim copy of the instrument which was originally offered as an amendment to the so-called Vandenberg resolution and which was tabled, as I have mentioned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 295), as follows:

Resolved, That the Resettlement Administration is requested to report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, (1) the nature and extent of all expenditures made or proposed to be made by such Administration; (2) the nature and extent of projects undertaken by it, and the advisability of undertaking future projects; (3) the effect of each such project on States and local taxation and on local real-estate values; (4) the extent to which such projects have benefited and will benefit labor; and (5) the circumstances relating to the securing of persons as tenants or purchasers in connection with such projects, and the effect on such persons of becoming such tenants or purchasers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey now presents as a separate resolution the substance of an amendment which he proposed to what we know as the Vandenberg resolution. When that amendment was offered, as is recalled, having had no opportunity to consider it and regarding it as unrelated to the subject matter of the resolution then under consideration, I objected and moved to lay the amendment on the table, which action was taken, and which I think was the course the Senate should have pursued in the matter.

I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution now presented. Upon consultation with the head of the Resettlement Administration, I am informed that much of the information called for is available in reports already made and the remainder of it will be very promptly supplied. I have no objection to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for his cooperation in this connection.

I desire to submit for the guidance of the Resettlement Administration a list of questions which I had in mind at one time offering in the form of a resolution. I realize these suggestions or questions are not binding on the administration,

for I do not pretend that they come within the scope of the resolution which has just been adopted. However, to save time, I should like to suggest that the Resettlement Administration at least give consideration to this list of subjects, though, as I have pointed out, I do not want any Senator to feel that I am attempting to go beyond the limitations recited in the resolution just adopted.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I had understood that if the resolution was presented in the form in which the Senator offered it this morning and was agreed to it would meet the Senator's requirements for information. In view of that fact, I think the Senator ought not now to attempt to supplement his resolution by submitting additional questions. I call for the regular order.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing not to pursue the matter at this time, and I am content to await such information as we may get from the Resettlement Administration, and then see if there is anything additional that will be required.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the word "nineteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty", so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay more than 20 officers of the Naval Reserve and 1 officer of the Marine Corps Reserve above the grade of lieutenant or captain, respectively—

And so forth.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment has to do with the personnel of the Naval Reserve. I understand the Navy Department recommended 23 officers and the Budget recommended 20. For some reason with which I am not familiar the number has been reduced to 19. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] whether he would be willing to accept the amendment in order that it may go to conference and we may learn the reason why the number was reduced?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference in order to afford opportunity to ascertain the reason why the change was made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further amendments, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the appropriation bill for naval purposes provides for more than half a billion dollars of total expenditure. Included in that sum is an amount for beginning the construction of several additional destroyers, submarines, and battleships. On page 50, line 7, is a provision reading:

For the commencement of the following vessels authorized by the act approved March 27, 1934: (a) Twelve destroyers and 6 submarines, and (b) not more than 2 capital ships, as replacements of over-age capital ships, to be undertaken only in the event that the President determines as a fact that capital ship-replacement construction is commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armament signed at London April 22, 1930, \$115,300,000.

I am not quite sure what the latter part of that provision means as applied to two battleships. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill just what the language means.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, as the Senator no doubt will remember, we scrapped a number of ships in order to bring our strength of capital ships within the number fixed by the

Washington Treaty. At this time, under the treaty, we might provide for the laying down of as many as eight battleships, but the committee believed that no such construction should be undertaken. In the hope that we might induce other governments not to engage in or commence the construction of capital ships, we have provided, even though one of our capital ships is 29 years of age, that the keel of no new battleship shall be laid down unless the signatories to the treaty shall undertake to commence the construction of battleships.

We are putting this Government in the position of saying: "We have sought to limit the construction of battleships. We have recently made another effort. It has not been as successful as we should have liked it to be. We want to make still further efforts. Even though after December 31 of this year there is no limitation at all upon the construction of battleships, we hold out the hope and the request that the signatory powers will not engage in the further construction of battleships."

Congress says, as evidence of that spirit on our part, that no replacement shall be undertaken at all unless the other signatory powers shall begin the construction of battleships. That is what the language means.

Mr. FRAZIER. Then, as I understand, the provision about the two battleships is just a bluff to try to keep other nations from starting to build. It is serving notice on other nations that if they start to build we will do likewise.

Mr. BYRNES. The first statement of the Senator is his own interpretation. I have stated the effect of the language. The language is plain that notwithstanding the fact that three battleships of our treaty Navy are over age—one is 29 years old and the other two are 26 years old, as I recall—and notwithstanding the fact that under the language of the treaty we could build eight, we prefer to build none. We are appropriating for no replacements and will continue with the Navy we have, without such replacements, unless the signatory powers which have heretofore agreed to the limitation of armaments shall undertake the construction of battleships, in which case, if the President finds it to be a fact, he may commence the construction of ships, but in no case may he begin the construction of more than two.

Mr. BENSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BENSON. I desire to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question.

How many battleships of the type mentioned does the United States Navy now have?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not recall the number. I shall be glad to give the Senator a statement, found in the hearings, showing in detail the present number of each type of craft, the number now building, and the number that could be built under the treaty. In view of the Senator's interest in the subject, I imagine he would like to have it; and it would be far more accurate than my recollection would be.

Mr. BENSON. Do the naval experts or the military experts of this country agree that these so-called battleships are the type of ship we should build at this time to defend our country?

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator that I asked that very question. The General Board of our Navy are of the opinion that the treaty navy which was agreed upon in 1922, at the conference presided over by Chief Justice Hughes, constitutes an adequate Navy for our defense. They are firmly of the opinion that the program which has heretofore been adopted by the Congress in what is known as the Vinson-Trammell bill provides all the program of construction that should ever be undertaken by us.

The question the Senator has in his mind we developed before the committee to find out who constituted the general board, which determines this question for the Navy of the United States. That Board is constituted of officers selected mainly from ships afloat who are called in. The personnel does not always remain the same; it is changed from time to time; but the members of the Board are unanimously of the opinion that the program which has been advocated by

them and adopted by the Congress will provide the best and most adequate defense for the United States.

Mr. WALSH. And the members of the Board are selected by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. BYRNES. That is a correct statement.

Mr. BENSON. Does the Senator from South Carolina know whether or not any experts in military defense or naval defense other than those actively engaged in the military service at this time were called before the committee to testify in regard to these matters?

Mr. BYRNES. Two separate matters have been discussed. The policy which has heretofore been adopted by the Congress was adopted only after very extensive hearings conducted by the Naval Affairs Committees of both Houses. The Appropriations Committee is, of course, simply supplying the appropriations for ships which have been authorized; but in this case, making an exception to the ordinary rule, it is not supplying appropriations for expenditures which have been heretofore authorized by the Congress. It is the policy of the Congress to do so, as laid down in the Vinson-Trammell bill, which is now the law; but instead of appropriating for these two ships we have put in the condition that the construction of the ships shall not be begun except in a certain contingency in the hope that we may offer an inducement to other signatory powers to continue the limitation we have advocated in previous years, and which we still favor, and which I should say to the Senator the officials in charge of our Navy favor. Their position is that the Navy which was agreed upon in 1922 is amply adequate for our defense, and they do not even ask for the construction of ships that would bring the Navy up to treaty strength.

Mr. BENSON. Was the Senator from South Carolina present yesterday when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] spoke, and made some reference to the statement of Admiral Standley regarding his attitude toward naval armaments and treaties?

Mr. BYRNES. I was. What the Senator from North Dakota said in quoting Admiral Standley was really a newspaper statement as to what Admiral Standley said upon his arrival in this country from the Limitation of Armaments Conference.

My conclusion was that if the admiral was correctly quoted it is unfortunate that the Senator from North Dakota has not the sense of humor that the Chief of Naval Operations has. Sometimes it is a blessing to a man to have a sense of humor; sometimes it is a little unfortunate; but, as I listened to the statement, knowing the Chief of Naval Operations, the conclusion I reached was that the Chief of Naval Operations had reference only to a very celebrated statement of a very celebrated citizen of this country, Will Rogers, whose statement all over this Nation was that "we never lost a war and we never won a conference."

The newspaper quoted Admiral Standley as saying, in response to many questions propounded to him by correspondents, "Well, I do not think we have lost a damned thing." I was satisfied that the admiral, not wishing to discuss what had occurred at the conference, and wondering, as all of us have sometimes wondered, what to tell the newspapermen, decided that he would answer Will Rogers by saying he was returning from the conference, but all he would say was, "I do not think we have lost a damned thing."

Mr. BENSON. I hope the Senator's interpretation is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. I may say to the Senator that if he knew the attitude of the present Chief of Naval Operations he would feel that I am entirely correct in the statement I have made as to what he said.

Mr. BENSON. Let me ask the Senator from South Carolina a further question: If we should find it necessary to build the two battleships which are provided for in this bill, how many additional auxiliary craft would we have to build in order to defend those two battleships, and how much money, if any, would that cost?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it does not follow that any additional auxiliary craft would be constructed other than the planes which accompany battleships; that is all.

The construction of two additional battleships would not call for the construction of any additional auxiliaries.

Mr. BENSON. I mean, would it call for the construction of any additional auxiliary craft if the battleships were to be of any value in our national defense?

Mr. BYRNES. When we come to that, it would not, if we are to rely upon our General Board; and they have no program for the construction of any craft other than those provided for in the bill.

Mr. BENSON. When the Appropriations Committee met and considered the bill, the Senator says they took into consideration some former plan of the Congress.

Mr. BYRNES. No; not a plan, but the existing law.

Mr. BENSON. The existing law?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. BENSON. Is it not quite possible that recent modern inventions have made these battleships unnecessary?

Mr. BYRNES. The law to which I refer is the law passed at the last session of the Congress, if my recollection is correct, providing for the construction not only of these but of many more ships. It is not something in the remote past, but the last word as to the policy of the Government as to construction. Following, though, what I have heretofore said as to the opinion of the General Board as to what should be done, this recommendation comes to us from the General Board; and the Senator and I must rely upon the recommendations of the experts of the Navy as to such matters.

I think it should be said at some time, and I should like to say it now, that the men who constitute our Navy are selected in about the most democratic manner of which I can possibly conceive. They do not come from a militaristic caste. Whatever may be said of other governments, in this country we should remember that the men who constitute the Navy come from the country, from Kansas, California, Minnesota, or Carolina. They are selected by Senators and Representatives.

I think they reflect credit upon the Senators and the Members of the House who selected them; but they come, not from the coast but from every section of the country, and constitute as good a cross section of the American people as we could possibly find, because they cannot enter the academy until they pass the examination; and their character, their loyalty, and their patriotism are passed upon by the Senators and the Members of the House, who have an opportunity to know them intimately and to make inquiries regarding them. If we cannot rely upon the patriotism of those men to make the best possible recommendations that they can make for the best defense of their country, then we are at a loss to know how we could proceed.

Mr. BENSON. I think everything the Senator has said regarding the midshipmen and the cadets is absolutely correct. Nevertheless, I think we should all bear in mind the fact that the midshipmen and the cadets enter Annapolis and West Point at a very young and immature age; and it is quite possible that the philosophy they are taught at these schools has something to do with their present attitude. Probably the fact that some of them, after they leave the academy, have command of great battleships, and are able to demand of the men under them service, and have great authority in the command of these great ships, may have something to do with their attitude toward the naval program.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I think the Senator will agree that when the young man becomes a midshipman, he is taught by men who were appointed to the Navy by some gentlemen who may now be Members of the Senate, who came from the same source from which the midshipman came, from the various States, from the country, and I do not believe that the Members of the Senate or of the House have exercised bad judgment in selecting the men who compose our Navy, and who dominate it.

Of course, we often hear it said that in order to get a promotion a man might be influenced in his judgment. That might be so in the case of some individuals; but as I look around the Senate I see many men who make sacrifices in order to serve the public, and I believe the men they

select to go to the Naval Academy have just as much patriotism as those who come here, and while there may be some selfish human beings there, as there may be here, still, on the whole, we have reason to rely on the patriotism of these men, and to have confidence that they would not, for the sake of promotion, make a recommendation that was not for the best interest of their country.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, it has been repeatedly stated that the additional armaments provided in the bill are just for defense. The term "adequate defense" is used frequently, and there seems to be a wide variation of opinion as to what that term means. I have here a clipping from one of the local papers, the Washington Herald of April 21, referring to a message the President sent to the D. A. R. convention being held in this city at that time. The paper quotes the outlines and aims of the President as follows:

One. An adequate defense to protect the Nation against foreign aggression.

Two. An increase of armament only to keep pace with the increases of other countries.

Three. Pursuit of the "good neighbor" policy in our relations with other nations.

Four. A reiteration of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty obligations renouncing war as an instrument of national policy.

Mr. President, in the discussion yesterday it was quite conclusively shown, it seemed to me, that there was no likelihood at present of any other nation attacking this country, and that if we were not trying to plan for aggressive warfare there would be no need of building two more big battleships and the cruisers which are mentioned in the bill.

The President in his message to the D. A. R. convention referred to the Briand-Kellogg Pact, and, lest some have forgotten what the Kellogg Pact was, I desire to read it. It is short; it consists of two short articles:

ARTICLE I. The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

Of course, that means that we are absolutely against aggressive warfare.

ART. II. The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means.

A representative of our country was instrumental in getting this pact adopted by 62 other nations, and some of us thought that our own Government meant what it said when it influenced 62 other nations to adopt this pact. Yet when we stop to consider what our own country did to carry out this treaty, and what we are doing to carry it out, it seems amazing, to say the least.

The President refers to the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. His fourth article, as outlined here, was, "A reiteration of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty obligations renouncing war as an instrument of national policy."

Yet in the War Department appropriation bill this year, and in the Navy Department appropriation bill, before us now, we appropriate the largest amount ever appropriated in peacetimes in this Nation or in any other nation, and it seems to me that that is not carrying out the Kellogg-Briand Pact in good faith. In fact, we have never carried it out in good faith, because beginning immediately after the adoption of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, in the next appropriation bill that came along, the very next year, we appropriated more money than we had appropriated before for military and naval purposes, and we have continued to increase almost every year since that time, until now we have reached the peak of well over a billion dollars, and we are providing in this bill for \$115,300,000 to lay down more battleships, more cruisers, and more submarines.

I suppose it might be argued that submarines are necessary to protect our shore lines against foreign ships which might attempt to attack us. But I can see no possible defense for the appropriations for the cruisers provided for or the other two battleships.

The President says we want to carry out the provisions of the Kellogg Peace Pact renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. Yet we are leaving it up to the President in regard to these two battleships, and article 2 of his outline as quoted in the press is "An increase of armament only to keep pace with the increases of other countries."

We were the Nation instrumental in the adoption of the Kellogg Peace Pact, and now it is said we are going to ask for new construction only to keep pace with other nations. Because it has been stated in some of the press that Great Britain is about to begin the building of two more battleships, it is thought to be necessary for the United States also to begin to build two more battleships to keep pace with Great Britain, merely in order to have our Navy a little bit larger than that of Great Britain.

Mr. President, as I understand, the new battleships are expected to cost \$51,000,000 apiece, if they are built, and it will cost \$2,000,000 a year to operate them after they are built. It has been stated by men high in Army and Navy circles, who know, I believe, what they are talking about, that these great dreadnaughts would be absolutely useless in the event of another world war. A very noted general made the statement 2 or 3 years ago before one of the committees of Congress that in the event of another world war the battleships of the United States Navy should be run just as far up the Mississippi River as they could go, because one well-directed bomb would sink one of these \$50,000,000 battleships to the bottom of the ocean. It is now proposed to build two more of these floating arsenals, costing \$51,000,000 each to build, in order, I suppose, that in case of war they may be run up the Mississippi River as far as they can get in order to keep them from being sunk to the bottom of the ocean.

We are pledged to economy and are trying to cut down expenses. Only a few short weeks ago the Agricultural Committees of the House and of the Senate reported out bills providing for seed and feed loans to take care of unfortunate farmers who, by reason of drought and crop failures, were unable to provide seed for the spring planting and feed for their farm animals. We passed a compromise bill carrying \$50,000,000 for that purpose. The bill was vetoed by the President on the ground that we could not afford an appropriation of that kind because it would unbalance the Budget, or, at least, prevent getting closer to a balance. In the pending bill we are now providing \$115,000,000, over twice as much as the feed and seed loan bill provided, for the beginning of construction of new battleships and other warships. What are we doing that for? Just to keep pace with Great Britain. Just to have a navy a little larger than Great Britain's Navy.

Mr. President, I cannot see any other answer to the question as to why so much money is being provided for naval purposes. If anyone can give any other reason, I should like to have it.

The seed-loan bill was vetoed, and an Executive order was issued, as will be recalled, to furnish money from other funds for the seed loans. The situation of the farmer developed into a terrible one. Seed loans could not be provided. Seeding time was rapidly passing, and, finally, a little over a week ago, some arrangements were made to take care of at least a large part of the requests for seed loans. There will be thousands of farmers throughout the great agricultural States of the Northwest who this year will not have enough seed to put in a sufficiently large crop to provide for themselves, their families, and their livestock during the coming year until another crop shall have been grown, to say nothing about paying their running expenses, taxes, and interest on loans.

Thousands of farms are being foreclosed. Farm foreclosures are being made at the rate, we are told, of over 2,000 a month, with the Federal land banks themselves foreclosing on farmers unable to pay their loans. Yet we are appropriating for the coming year for our war system \$1,000,000,000, which amounts to more than two and one-half million dollars every day of the year, for this war

system. Let our farmers have their farms foreclosed! Let their homes be taken away from them! Let people be driven out of employment and into the bread-lines, and let children go hungry to school every day, but we must prepare for adequate defense! Adequate defense for what, Mr. President? Adequate defense for what? The only answer I can see to the question as to what is meant by the phrase "adequate defense", as it is regarded by the President and others who are advocating the passage of this big naval bill, is to have our Navy and Army just a little larger and a little more powerful than that of any other nation on earth and to spend a little more money for that purpose than is spent by any other nation on earth.

Mr. President, it seems to me the Navy bill might be cut down a great deal. At least the provision for the laying down of new battleships and cruisers, and so forth, might well be cut out of the bill. I propose to offer an amendment to strike that provision from the bill.

We are supposed to be a peace-loving nation, and we call ourselves a highly civilized and even a Christian nation. Yet we are preparing for war. The pending naval appropriation bill and the War Department appropriation bill which was passed during the present session of Congress mean nothing less than preparation for war. Last year, out of every dollar spent for general expenses of the Government, 61 cents went to pay for wars past, present, and future. Judging from the preparations we are now making, the percentage will be larger for the coming year than it was last year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the ratio for war purposes exceeded the figure given by the Senator. I recall that when Andrew Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury he submitted a statement to the effect that 70 percent of all taxes received by the Federal Government was expended for wars—past, present, and future.

Mr. FRAZIER. I recall that very well. I think at one time 71 cents out of every dollar expended by the Government went for war purposes, but during the last year the difference in the figures has not been so great; not because we are not spending more money for war, because, as a matter of fact, we are, but we are spending more money for other government purposes than we did a few years ago.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from North Dakota, that in view of the recent appropriation of more than \$2,000,000,000 for the bonus, plus more than \$1,200,000,000 which we will appropriate this year for the Army and the Navy, the figure which the Senator has indicated must be increased from 60 percent to approximately 70 percent.

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; undoubtedly the figure will be raised for the coming year. Of course, the payment of the bonus to the soldiers is a part of our war expense. We drafted those boys and sent them to war. I believe they are entitled to be taken care of when they come back from the war, and the bonus is a part of that care of those boys.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator's statement is a little too broad. We did not draft all who served in the military forces. The Senator will remember that there were hundreds of thousands, if not several million young men who volunteered, and many of those who were drafted would have volunteered except for the reason that the Government desired that they should delay their entrance into the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. BENSON. We did pass the draft act.

Mr. KING. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. FRAZIER. It was held, of course, that the fairest way was to draft the young men to go to the Army. Of course, we made the mistake of not drafting wealth along with drafting the boys in order to pay for the war as we went along. Had we done that we would not have had the immense debt burden of thirty some billion dollars hanging

over us. Practically the whole of the debt is directly or indirectly war debt, because the depression was brought on as the result of the World War. We cannot get away from that conclusion.

The President in his recent message to the D. A. R. conference intimated, or at least implied, that we were preparing for adequate defense because adequate defense will keep us out of war. That is a term which has been used by the preparedness people for years and years—that we must prepare in order to keep ourselves out of war. Germany with her compulsory military training system was armed for adequate defense at the beginning of the World War. Did her adequate defense keep Germany out of the war? No. France was also adequately prepared, and so was Austria, and so was Great Britain, and their adequate preparedness did not keep them out of the World War. They were the first countries to get into it.

The Honorable William Jennings Bryan, in 1915, after the war had started, but before we got into it, in a speech said he hoped that the World War would at least do away with that old saying that preparedness would keep us out of war because, he said, the nations which were best prepared were the first ones to get into it. Mr. Bryan further said that if the United States had been as well prepared as some of the preparedness people had demanded that we should be, that we would undoubtedly have gone into the World War much earlier than we did.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. Would the Senator do away with an army and a navy altogether?

Mr. FRAZIER. I certainly would. I have pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate a joint resolution to provide for an amendment to the Constitution to outlaw war and preparation for war. If we are going to have disarmament and peace, Mr. President, I believe we must go the limit. We cannot talk about adequate defense and at the same time talk of disarmament or peace. The people of the other nations of the world are anxious for disarmament and world peace also, and I believe that if the United States were to set a shining example by carrying out the principles set forth in the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact, other nations would follow suit at once and we would have disarmed nations and world peace.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. President Wilson did attempt to set a shining example through the establishment of the League of Nations which would set up some kind of law and order in international affairs in place of a condition of anarchy, but the United States would have none of it and, of course, we were perforce thrown back upon our own self-defense, because we would not have law and order in international affairs but chose rather to perpetuate anarchy.

Mr. FRAZIER. Other nations went into the League of Nations. Would the Senator from Indiana say that the League of Nations has kept the other nations that are members of the League of Nations and of the World Court, out of war, and kept them from anarchy?

Mr. MINTON. If we are to outlaw war we must have something to take the place of the anarchy which exists in international affairs today.

Mr. FRAZIER. I agree with that.

Mr. MINTON. If war is not outlawed through the League of Nations it can only be outlawed by some organization of similar nature.

Mr. FRAZIER. I voted against our entrance into the League of Nations, because I did not like the way the League of Nations was set up. I did not think it was honestly intended for a peace organization, and I have not changed my mind about it, because of the occurrences which have taken place in recent years in the League of Nations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I have a high regard for my friend from North Dakota and for his views and hesitate to dissent from some of his expressions. However, I do not agree with the statement which he made respecting the purposes back of the League. The Senator will recall that the idea of a league or concert of nations was not new. It had been advocated for centuries. William Penn, Abbe Pierre, and others advocated a league or organization of nations along the line of the frame of the League of Nations contained in the Versailles Treaty.

Gen. Jan Smuts, of South Africa, one of the greatest statesmen of this age, was largely responsible for the draft of the League which was presented to the Paris Conference. Undoubtedly, President Wilson played an important part in framing and securing the adoption of the covenant of the League of Nations. General Smuts had from experience in wars learned of their devastating effects. He was a lover of peace, as was President Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Lord Cecil, and others who participated in the Versailles Conference. They believed the time had come for the establishment of an international organization which would provide collective security and set up some instrumentality that would prevent war, or at least remove many of the causes of war. They believed it necessary to create a tribunal to which reference might be made for the settlement of international controversies, such controversies which otherwise would be settled upon bloody battlefields.

I have no doubt that those who drafted the Versailles Treaty, which embodied the League Covenant, sincerely believed that it would prevent many international conflicts. They were actuated by the highest motives and sought only the good and welfare of the world. Unfortunately, for the League, our Nation did not ratify the Versailles Treaty; unfortunately Japan and Germany have withdrawn from the League. This Nation, with its great resources, with its power, physical, moral, and spiritual—and I emphasize the two latter; I believe we have moral and spiritual power—would have strengthened the League and would have given to it a permanency, a potency, and a prestige of which it was deprived. It is believed by many that our country, in part at least, is responsible for the failure of the League to reach those heights that it would have attained and which would have brought the results which it was anticipated would be realized under the provisions of the Covenant.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Utah how he thinks we would have accomplished the result of keeping Japan, for instance, and Germany and Italy in line? Would the Senator have favored raising an army and using it and our naval forces to keep Japan in line and to keep Germany and Italy in line?

Mr. KING. No; but I believe that if the United States had joined the League and sat down at the council table, as it would have done—at the head of the table, may I say?—that the current of the world's history would have been different. If that had been done, it is reasonably certain that Germany and Japan would not have left the League. The failure of the United States to enter the League undoubtedly led other nations to doubt its effectiveness or the possibility of realizing the ideals which it was understood the League represented and to attain that for which it was organized.

I cannot but believe that if the United States had been a member of the League it would have been a great factor and a pervasive influence for peace and security in a troubled world.

Let me make one further observation. When President Wilson came back from the Versailles Conference with the Covenant of the League of Nations, and presented it to the Senate, I had the opportunity of conferring with him in his room in the Capitol a few minutes after he had delivered his message. I asked him why he had been so insistent upon the acceptance of the covenant, before the treaty was completed. He said to me, in substance—I shall not attempt to quote him literally—that he believed, with the smoke of battle in the eyes of the representatives of the belligerent

nations no treaty could be drawn that would be free from imperfections, if not injustices. He referred to the invasion of France and Belgium and to the loss of lives of the allied forces.

He said that under such conditions it could not be expected that the people of the suffering nations would forget and forgive the wrongs to which they believed they had been subjected, and therefore he regarded it as necessary that some agency should be established to which appeals might be made for rectification of such injustices as might develop in the enforcement of the treaty. He said further that if an instrumentality was not set up to meet developments then violence would be resorted to and upon the battlefields efforts to obtain redress would be made. I believe, Mr. President, the views of President Wilson were those of a great patriot, a sincere lover of justice and peace among all nations. If his high ideals had been carried out by this and other nations the whole face of the world now would be different.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opinion of the Senator; I appreciate his earnestness in looking toward world peace; but I wish to ask the Senator from Utah if he does not think if a small part of the money we are now spending for war preparation could be used to promote peace—honestly to promote peace—that it would be money well spent and would be very helpful in promoting world peace?

Mr. KING. I answer that unhesitatingly in the affirmative. I agree with some of the observations made by the Senator a few moments ago when he was criticizing this enormous appropriation carried in this bill. I do not justify it. I think that when we arrange to build two battleships it will compel other nations to revise their naval and military programs and invite them to larger expenditures. When this Nation, impregnable as it is, is willing to spend and does spend from \$100,000,000 to \$200,000,000 per annum more than does any other nation in the world for military purposes, other nations will inquire as to the purpose of such apparent military preparedness; they will be inclined to perceive in our activities sinister motives and say that the United States is arming in order to commit some aggression upon other lands.

Of course, that is not true; but the very fact that we spend so much money for military purposes will result in other nations augmenting their military expenditures and will intensify the suspicions, if not the hatreds, that may be developed in other nations against the United States. We should spend more for peace and less for war. We should do more to organize for peace and less to organize for war.

Mr. FRAZIER. The fact, of course, that we continue to increase our appropriations for war purposes has resulted in other nations increasing their appropriations for war purposes.

Mr. KING. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FRAZIER. And will have the same result in the future.

Mr. KING. That is correct.

Mr. BENSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I will be glad to answer the Senator, if I can.

Mr. BENSON. It being true, as the Senator says, that we are spending more than a billion dollars on military preparedness, and that we are spending annually \$200,000,000 more than is spent by any other nation in the world, if we are not spending that money for the purpose of aggression, why are we spending it?

Mr. KING. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. BENSON. It seems to me those who are managing the large appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments, amounting to more than a billion dollars should come here prepared to tell us what they are for, if they are not for aggression.

Mr. KING. Perhaps it is paradoxical, but I do not believe, of course, that my country has in view any aggression against any other country. We have indicated by our course by withdrawing our sovereignty over Cuba and the Philippine Islands—or at least have permitted the Filipinos to set up a government of their own and agreed to withdraw our own sovereignty entirely within a few years—and by indicating recently to another island that came to the United States as the result of the Spanish-American War our willingness to surrender sovereignty. So the United States has no purpose to wage war against any other nation, either a strong nation or a weak nation. We want the friendship of Latin American as well as the friendship of all other nations; but when we expend these huge sums, I fear that our action will excite fears and apprehensions upon their part and lead some to believe that the United States meditates some aggressive movement against other powers. Therefore I believe in part with my friend that this Nation could make no finer gesture for world peace, for limitation of armaments in the world, than to say, "We will reduce our military expenditures to a minimum; we propose to indicate to you that we have no purpose to infringe upon any nation; we desire to be leaders in a great world movement for the peace and happiness of all peoples and to secure the abolition of war."

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. Our officials talk about disarmament and world peace, but continue to prepare for war. That is the situation. This makes us wonder whether or not our officials mean what they say and say what they mean.

Throughout history the nations which were adequately armed were the ones which went to war. Preparation for national defense and not for conquest sounds very plausible, but thinking people, of course, realize, because they have heard the same argument year after year repeatedly and must know by this time if they have not found out before, that so-called adequate defense has not kept nations out of war. No thinking citizen will agree that the building up of a great Navy, as we are undertaking to do now, is necessary in order to defend ourselves against Great Britain, that it is necessary for us to have a little bit larger navy than Great Britain in order to defend ourselves against that nation. I do not think anyone will contend there is any likelihood of Great Britain attacking the United States. For that matter, I think there is no danger of any other nation attacking the United States.

Let us analyze just a little the term "adequate defense." What does it mean? It might be possible that we could adequately defend our Nation against any one great nation. That might be possible. I doubt it very much as to any one of the great nations, but conceding that we could adequately defend ourselves against Great Britain, what would be the situation if we should get into a war with Great Britain and the other great nations of the world should join as allies of Great Britain against the United States? Would it be possible for us to arm adequately against the rest of the world? I do not believe it could be done by any means, by the United States or any other nation.

It is further conceded that so-called up-to-date scientific methods of warfare make it impossible for anything like adequate defense to be had. With modern war appliances, remote control of airplanes, bombing planes with explosives and poison gas and disease germs and other so-called civilized devices for the annihilation of humanity, there is no such thing as adequate defense.

In recent months there have been so-called sham battles of the air in several countries, the principal ones of which were held a few months ago over London, over Paris, and over New York. In each instance the enemy's planes have succeeded in getting back of the defensive plans and coming in over the cities. The official board of the sham battle of the air over London reported—and it was after a continuation of the air battle for 5 days—that it was absolutely impossible to keep out the enemy planes. They also stated that one of the big bombing planes with explosives and fire bombs and poison gas and disease germs could annihilate the greater part of any other city—just one plane! The

New York situation and the Paris situation were the same. So when we talk about adequate defense, if we mean to protect ourselves and the lives of our people against the attack of any other country or all the other countries, there is no such thing.

When the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] was talking about the League of Nations it recalled to my mind the fact that the United States was instrumental in getting us into the Kellogg Peace Pact and getting the nations of the world to sign that pact. Yet we have not lived up to it by any means, and no one can truthfully say we have. It is true we have not declared war or gone to war with any other nation, but we have spent more money than we ever did before in peace times for war purposes and we have spent more money than any other nation has spent for similar purposes. It cannot be said in truth that we have lived up to the Kellogg Peace Pact ourselves.

It seems to me the great question confronting us is whether we really want disarmament and peace or whether we want war and preparation for war. We have had disarmament conferences. As was pointed out yesterday by my colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], Army officers were appointed to the Disarmament Conference, one of them being an Army officer, whose sole training had been toward more and greater preparedness for war. Undoubtedly every Senator knows personally some of the men who were named as official delegates to the Disarmament Conference, so-called, and knew when they were appointed that they did not stand for disarmament but favored a bigger navy and a bigger army and were in favor of the so-called preparedness program. So it seems to me that even our own officials who are backing this great program do not really believe in what they are giving out to the public—that preparedness is for adequate defense and for defensive purposes only.

An interesting question was suggested about total disarmament. I am frank to say that at one time I introduced a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to outlaw war. We had some hearings on the proposed amendment, and some very good evidence was submitted to the committee. The proposed amendment was sponsored by the Women's Peace Union, with headquarters in New York City. At the first hearing we held upon the proposed amendment we invited other peace organizations to come before the committee to give their views. None of them would come. Not a representative of any peace organization came before that committee except the Women's Peace Union, with headquarters in New York City. Later we held another hearing, and at that hearing a few more peace organizations were represented. At the last hearing we held—April 14, 1934—so many peace organizations made application to be heard that we could not take care of all of them.

Only a few weeks ago there was a national peace conference held in the city of Washington with practically all of the great peace organizations joining in it. One of the speakers at the banquet said that up until that time the peace organizations had contented themselves largely with preparing resolutions asking for disarmament and peace and sending them to Congress or to the President. He said:

Now is the time to get together and cooperate and work along the same line.

I believe they will accomplish something by such a course. The speaker even went so far as to say the peace organizations should take some consideration of the political situation; in other words, that they should think something about electing men to office who honestly advocated disarmament and peace, and not content themselves with electing big Army men and big Navy men or preparedness men who were in favor of these immense appropriations for so-called preparedness. I think that was another step in the right direction.

I wish to read just a brief statement from the hearings on the resolution to which I have just referred proposing to outlaw war. It was made by Miss Byrns, an attorney of New

York City, who was one of the officials of the Women's Peace Union of that city, who were instrumental in backing the resolution to outlaw war. Before the Committee on the Judiciary, April 14, 1934, she said:

Nothing has been done. Nothing fundamental, honest, direct has even been attempted. Several Presidents have sent delegates to disarmament conferences, but the delegates have not even talked of genuine, complete disarmament. The country favored the Kellogg Pact because it was advertised as outlawing war. The Senate, with its tongue in its cheek, ratified this pact and voted for battleships.

That is the truth, Mr. President.

However, even had the pact been taken seriously by the Government, it could not prevent such war preparations as the Vinson bill provides for.

That was a naval bill which was pending at that time.

The war powers are still in the Constitution—a constant threat to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; a constant menace to beauty, to human dignity, to civilization itself.

This amendment will take the war powers out of the Constitution. There is no other legal method of getting rid of them.

War is the slaughter of human beings on as large a scale as possible. It is organized, deliberate mass murder.

For what purpose? To protect trade and investments; collect debts and seize territory. To enrich munition makers and war profiteers. To satisfy the egos of little men, cover up the weakness and folly of ignorant, inept politicians.

War is never for the protection of life, the defense of human beings. You know that. We know it. Let us then have done with all the hypocritical, lying talk about self-defense. I believe the American people are weary of being duped and deceived by this false appeal to their finest as well as their basest emotions.

As a veteran of that great nonviolent revolution by which the women of the United States won freedom, I am convinced that any just cause can be won by peaceful methods and hard work.

As a lawyer, I bear witness to the fact that the best, the only satisfactory way, to settle disputes is by the use of constructive nonresistance.

As a citizen of the United States, I will not support war and I will not tolerate the fact that the Government of which I am a part shall longer have the power to prepare for, declare, or carry on war.

I am convinced that violence and bloodshed are always wrong in principle, disastrous in practice.

I urge an immediate report of Senate Joint Resolution No. 24.

Mr. President, those words were spoken by a woman who for years has been an attorney in the city of New York, who has also been interested and has taken a leading part in movements for world peace and real disarmament. I agree that if we are going to have disarmament, if we are going to have world peace, we shall have to go the limit. We cannot have disarmament or world peace and talk about adequate defense, because adequate defense means preparation for war if it means anything.

Mr. President, I realize that it does very little good to talk against this bill. The skids are all greased and ready to slide, and the bill will go through carrying the big appropriations; but I wish to offer the amendment, which I send to the desk. The amendment provides for striking out the provision on page 50 which makes available \$115,300,000 for starting the construction of new battleships and other war paraphernalia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, beginning with the word "and" in line 7, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I should like to have the yeas and nays on this important amendment. It will save \$115,000,000 to start with, and several hundred other million dollars afterward, if it shall be agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BENSON] desires to submit some observations; and it might be well to have that done before calling for a vote.

Mr. FRAZIER. Very well.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, may we have the amendment restated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be restated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, in line 7, beginning with the word "and", it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 16.

Mr. WALSH. I ask the Senator just what that will do.

Mr. FRAZIER. It will strike out the provision for starting the construction of 12 destroyers, 6 submarines, and not more than 2 capital ships as replacements of over-age capital ships, to be undertaken only in the event that the President determines as a fact that capital-ship replacement construction is commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the treaty for the limitation and reduction of naval armament.

Mr. WALSH. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota asks for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BENSON obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, what was the ruling on the request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is what I wish to know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling was that the yeas and nays were not ordered, as only five Members held up their hands.

Mr. FRAZIER. That is more than one-fifth of those present.

Mr. WALSH. I suggest that the request be resubmitted, and I am sure it will be granted.

Mr. FRAZIER. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, because five Members held up their hands, and I believe that is more than one-fifth of the number present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, the Chair assumes that a quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I submit that five is not one-fifth of those present, because presumptively there is a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Therefore, since 5 is not 20 percent of 49, the call of the yeas and nays is not in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, no presumption whatsoever is indulged in a case of this kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised by the parliamentarian that it is.

Mr. McNARY. I disagree with the parliamentarian. That is not correct practice and it has never been followed. The number necessary to order the yeas and nays is one-fifth of those present, and it is the duty of the Chair to count the number present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the custom has been to go back to the last roll call. On the last roll call 69 Senators were present, and 5 is not one-fifth of 69; so the ruling of the Chair will stand.

Mr. McNARY. I insist that the ruling is wrong, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

Mr. BENSON. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Byrnes	George	La Follette
Ashurst	Capper	Gerry	Logan
Austin	Caraway	Glass	Loneragan
Bachman	Clark	Guffey	McAdoo
Bailey	Connally	Hale	McGill
Barbour	Coolidge	Harrison	McKellar
Barkley	Couzens	Hastings	McNary
Benson	Davis	Hatch	Maloney
Black	Dieterich	Hayden	Minton
Bulkeley	Donahay	Johnson	Moore
Burke	Duffy	Keyes	Murphy
Byrd	Frazier	King	Murray

Overton	Robinson	Smith	Tydings
Pittman	Russell	Steiwer	Van Nuys
Pope	Schwellenbach	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh
Radcliffe	Sheppard	Thomas, Utah	White
Reynolds	Shipstead	Townsend	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. FRAZIER obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. FRAZIER. I gladly yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On the point of order that there must be a demand by one-fifth of those present in order to secure a yea and nay vote, I desire to set down in the RECORD my own view, without speaking for anyone other than myself.

I state as a matter of fundamental parliamentary law, whether there is any rule on the question or not, that the presumption always exists that there is a quorum present in the Senate unless a point of no quorum is made and the Senate by having the roll call determines that there is not a quorum present. Therefore, when a demand is made for the yeas and nays, unless one-fifth of the presumptive quorum present hold up their hands, the Chair is under no compulsion to order the roll called for a yea and nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has so held.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why is that true, Mr. President? If any other rule obtained, acts of Congress could be made to fall by the proof aliunde, in the courts, that there was not in fact a quorum of the Senate present when some particular action, either the passage of a bill or some other official action of the Senate, was taken. So it is absolutely and imperatively necessary for a legislative body to indulge the presumption, and for the courts and everyone else to be charged with knowledge of the presumption, that what is done is done in the presence of a quorum, unless that particular issue is raised, and the body affirmatively determines that there is not a quorum present. Otherwise, there would be legislative chaos.

It was merely for the purpose of maintaining that theory that I desired to set down in the RECORD the basis upon which I made the point of order that five Members of the Senate were not one-fifth of those present. It may not be written in the rules of the Senate, and I understand there is nothing in Hinds' Precedents on the question, but it is one of those absolutely fundamental things inhering in the very fiber of a legislative body.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FRAZIER. I gladly yield.

Mr. McNARY. I entertain a very high regard for the distinguished Senator from Texas as a statesman, but I do not think he knows much about the rules of the Senate. This question does not lie within the language of a rule, and we have no precedents to guide us, but it has been the practice of the Senate—and I speak as one who has been here nearly 19 years—that if one-fifth of those actually present ask for a roll call, a roll call is ordered.

The reason underlying the practice is plain. Much of the time we transact business without a quorum present. A quorum simply initiates a session. Whether we can proceed or not is not necessarily determined by the presence of a quorum. Therefore we do not indulge in any presumption whatsoever. The practice has been unbroken. This mode of procedure is based upon solid, substantial reason. When the yeas and nays are demanded the Chair must decide whether one-fifth of those present support the demand.

Let us take as an illustration what has happened today. The call of the roll this morning disclosed 72 Senators present. If thereafter 15 Senators had been on the floor, and 14 of those present had held up their hands demanding a yea-and-nay vote, under the theory of the distinguished statesman from Texas, the Chair could not have ordered the yeas and nays, because there would have to be 15 to make one-fifth of 72. The mere recital of the figures shows the absurdity of the position taken by the Senator from Texas. The practice has been, and properly so, that the Chair must deter-

mine whether one-fifth of those actually present hold up their hands in support of the demand for the yeas and nays.

I think I have covered the subject completely, and in a way which I think is explicable and understandable, and my position is based on the long, unbroken practice of this body.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon has explained the situation very clearly, as he generally does explain anything about which he speaks.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon for his kind and generous remarks about my ignorance as a parliamentarian. I make no pretense of being a parliamentary sharp. I think a parliamentary sharp in the Senate is somewhat of a nuisance. But I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that in my position I have respectable support in the parliamentarian of the Senate. The parliamentarian of the Senate has probably not been here 19 years, as has the Senator from Oregon, but the parliamentary precedents have been here much longer than has the Senator from Oregon. I respect the Senator's long service, and when I shall have been here 19 years I shall hope to know some small percentage of what the Senator from Oregon knows about parliamentary practice.

Let me illustrate, however. The Senator from Oregon contends that if 15 Members of the Senate were present and 14 held up their hands and demanded the yeas and nays, they could not get it. On the other hand, if only five Senators were present, and one of them held up his hand demanding the yeas and nays, the Chair would have to order the roll called, according to the theory of the Senator from Oregon. Is not that just as ridiculous as the example which he has cited, when he said that if 14 out of 15 actually present demanded the yeas and nays, they could not get them? According to the contention of the Senator from Oregon, one Senator could hold up his hand and have the yeas and nays, under the rule that one-fifth of those present can demand them.

I beg to differ from the views of the Senator from Oregon when he says that all that is necessary is that we have a quorum when we start business, and that then we can go ahead. The Constitution, speaking of the two Houses, provides:

A majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business.

The Senate cannot do a thing on earth legally unless a quorum is present. Therefore it has to indulge the presumption that a quorum is present until the question is raised and determined. That does not necessarily mean that the quorum has to sit in the front row or in the choice places. Some of the quorum may be out in the cloakroom. It usually is. Some of it may be here in the wings, reading newspapers. The presumption is that when a quorum first is established, the quorum continues to exist until the Senate itself determines that there is no quorum present. Any other theory or any other assumption would be absolutely destructive to legislative procedure and legislative processes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled, and there has been no appeal from that ruling. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I am not going to appeal from the decision of the Chair, but I agree with the Senator from Oregon that it is rather unusual to have a ruling of that kind. So far as I can remember since I have been a Member of the Senate this is the first time I have heard of a ruling of the kind that was made.

What the Senator from Texas says about a quorum is correct. Of course, no one is contending that business can be done officially without a quorum. Mr. President, we oftentimes transact business without a quorum on the floor. I think it is the intention to have a quorum on the floor at all times. However, that is not the practice. Oftentimes there are only a few Senators in the Chamber while business is being transacted. If yeas and nays are ordered when less than a quorum is present, of course, when the vote is taken there must be a quorum present or there is no official

vote. So I think the Senator's argument is not a very good one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he recognizes the Senator from North Dakota so that no injustice shall be done to him. The Chair now recognizes the Senator to renew his request for the yeas and nays on his amendment.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 50 of the pending Navy bill to strike out, beginning with the word "and" in line 7, down to and including all of line 16. That is, I propose to strike out the provision for an appropriation of \$115,300,000 to begin the building of 6 submarines, 12 destroyers, and 2 battleships. On my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have only a few words to say with reference to the proposed amendment. The effect of the Senator's amendment would be to stop the construction of all ships of the Navy now under construction.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. Do I understand the Senator to say that it would stop the construction of those ships which have been started?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. FRAZIER. I do not so understand.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I am going on to explain to the Senator that the estimate of the Navy Department includes only \$12,000,000 for expenditure upon vessels not under construction, but the balance of the \$115,000,000 provides for the construction of all the vessels referred to in the section under consideration, beginning in line 21, on page 49, which includes submarines, the aircraft carriers which are now under construction, the destroyers, and cruisers. The effect of the Senator's amendment would be to stop the construction of all vessels now being constructed for the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BENSON. Mr. President, do I understand from the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina regarding the \$115,000,000 clause that the United States Government can build 12 destroyers, 6 submarines, and 2 battleships for \$115,000,000.

Mr. BYRNES. No, Mr. President; it would be utterly impossible to do so. The Navy knows that \$12,000,000 would only be sufficient to enable them to do the preliminary work which must always be done. It takes 3 years to construct a battleship. The money which would have to be appropriated to pay the cost of construction of a battleship would be carried in appropriation bills over a period of 3 years in the future. The bill provides \$12,180,000 for the 1937 program. There would be no hope on the part of the Navy to do more than to prepare the plans. It takes many months to draft the plans for a battleship. If the Senator will look at the paragraph beginning on page 49, line 21, he will see that it winds up in line 16, on the following page, with \$115,000,000, and it provides for aircraft carriers, destroyers, cruisers, and several gunboats and other craft.

Mr. BENSON. Am I to understand from that statement that the \$529,125,806 provided in the bill carries nothing other than the \$12,000,000 which the Senator has mentioned for the construction of the two battleships?

Mr. BYRNES. Twelve million dollars.

Mr. BENSON. Twelve million dollars for the construction of the two battleships?

Mr. BYRNES. No; I will say to the Senator that it does not even include that. Should the contingency provided for in the bill arise and should the President see fit so to order, the Navy Department knows that out of this lump sum which is made available for the payment for ships now under construction they could do such preliminary work as could

possibly be done. The \$12,000,000 for new construction really provides for the submarines and the other craft mentioned, and there is no appropriation specifically designated for commencing the construction of any battleship.

Mr. BENSON. Then I must understand that should the President order the construction of the two battleships for which the bill authorizes the drawing of plans—

Mr. BYRNES. Then appropriations would have to be made.

Mr. BENSON. Appropriations would have to be made for \$104,000,000 more to construct the two battleships?

Mr. BYRNES. Appropriations would have to be made if they were commenced. The next naval bill would have to carry the appropriation for so much of the construction as in the opinion of the Navy Department would be completed during that fiscal year. The following fiscal year a similar appropriation would be carried.

Mr. BENSON. The cost of these battleships is estimated at approximately \$51,000,000 each; is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES. That estimate has been made.

Mr. BENSON. Then with the authorization to commence the construction of plans for two battleships costing \$51,000,000 each, we are in a measure obligating ourselves to the further appropriation of \$104,000,000 additional which is not provided in the pending bill?

Mr. BYRNES. The language is plain. I should say to the Senator in answer to his question that the estimate of cost includes armor and armaments and is not solely for the construction of ships.

Mr. BENSON. Yes; and the Senator might also say that the estimate of the cost of \$51,000,000 each does not provide for the auxiliary craft which are always provided to protect the battleships.

Mr. BYRNES. It does not provide, of course, for anything except the battleships.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I find a qualification on page 50, line 12, of the bill, as follows:

Only in the event that the President determines as a fact that capital-ship-replacement construction is commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armaments signed at London.

Under that language certain construction would be started, provided the President finds certain facts. If he does not find them, will that limit the construction?

Mr. BYRNES. If he does not find them, the construction of the battleships could not be undertaken at all.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That limitation only refers to the two battleships?

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not have the floor.

Mr. FRAZIER. Then, I desire to ask the Senator a question if I may. I wish to know how much of the \$115,300,000 in line 16 is to commence work on the two battleships which are spoken of?

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator that I have already answered the question in the last 2 minutes, that not a dollar is in contemplation for that purpose. The \$12,180,369 to which I referred is the estimated cost of beginning the 12 destroyers and 6 submarines.

Mr. FRAZIER. That is for the beginning of construction of the 12 destroyers and submarines?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. FRAZIER. I do not see why they need to be begun.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER]. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BULKLEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], who is necessarily absent from the Senate. I am advised that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. I am, therefore, free to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. BYRNES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] on the passage of this bill. I do not know whether the Senator would construe that pair as applying to the pending amendment, but I transfer the pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HAYDEN. My colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is necessarily detained from the Senate. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. LOGAN (after having voted in the negative). I am advised that my general pair, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], would, if present, vote as I have voted. Therefore I let my vote stand.

Mr. ROBINSON. The junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] are detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] are detained in the Committee on Finance.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained on account of a death in his family.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS];

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]; and

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN].

I am not advised as to how any of the Senators mentioned would vote on this question if present.

I also announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE]. I am advised that if the Senator from Vermont were present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair) (after having voted in the negative). The present occupant of the chair has a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. He transfers that pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and allows his vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—12

Benson	Donahey	McGill	Pope
Capper	Frazier	Murphy	Shipstead
Clark	King	Murray	Thomas, Utah

NAYS—40

Adams	Caraway	Hayden	Pittman
Austin	Connally	Johnson	Radcliffe
Bachman	Couzens	Keyes	Reynolds
Bailey	Dieterich	Logan	Robinson
Barbour	Duffy	Loneragan	Russell
Barkley	George	McAdoo	Schwellenbach
Bulkeley	Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard
Burke	Glass	Maloney	Smith
Byrd	Hale	Minton	Walsh
Byrnes	Hatch	Moore	White

NOT VOTING—44

Ashurst	Copeland	La Follette	Overton
Bankhead	Costigan	Lewis	Steiwer
Bilbo	Davis	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Dickinson	McCarran	Townsend
Bone	Fletcher	McNary	Trammell
Borah	Gibson	Metcalf	Truman
Brown	Gore	Neely	Tydings
Bulow	Guffey	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Carey	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Chavez	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Coolidge	Holt	O'Mahoney	Wheeler

So Mr. FRAZIER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. BENSON. Mr. President, very briefly, I wish to make a few observations regarding the pending bill.

Four years ago, at its national convention, the Democratic Party deplored the fact that this country was fast approaching a time when a billion dollars would be spent in preparation for war. Just a few weeks ago, with very few dissenting votes, we passed an Army appropriation bill providing for an expenditure of more than \$600,000,000. We now have pending before us in another appropriation bill, supposedly for national defense, the staggering sum of \$529,000,000.

I wonder if it is not about time that we make a survey, as was suggested in the platform of the Democratic Party 4 years ago at Chicago, into the purposes for which these extravagant sums are being spent? Is it not about time that we look into the purposes for which this money is being spent and try to find out just what we are getting for the millions and billions of dollars we are spending in Army and Navy equipment?

It has been stated here on the Senate floor today that battleships costing many million dollars become obsolete in less than 30 years; in fact, in less than 25 years; and yesterday it was stated that, because of modern inventions, practically our entire Navy is obsolete. The statement that present capital ships become obsolete after 20 or 25 years was made by those in charge of this bill which undertakes to appropriate \$529,000,000 for the very purpose, among others, of building more such ships.

The amendment which was just offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], and rejected, it seems to me was not very adequately explained to the Members of the Senate by those opposed to the amendment and those in charge of the bill. As I see it, the clause it was attempted to strike from the bill by the amendment would have prevented Congress from committing itself to the expenditure of \$104,000,000 or possibly \$208,000,000 not provided for or contemplated in the bill at all, but merely on the order of the President of the United States to commence work on the capital ships.

Mr. President, I desire to introduce at this time a joint resolution bearing upon this question. It is suggested to me by a paragraph in the platform adopted at the Democratic National Convention 4 years ago in Chicago. I send the joint resolution to the desk and ask that it may be read and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 263) to establish a policy of national defense was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Joint resolution to establish a policy of national defense

Whereas the Democratic Party, in party convention in Chicago, June 1932, submitted this platform:

"National defense: A navy and an army adequate for national defense based on a survey of all facts affecting the existing estab-

lishments, that the people in time of peace may not be burdened by an expenditure fast approaching \$1,000,000,000 annually."

And

Whereas the appropriations for the Army and the Navy during the 1937 fiscal year total more than \$1,000,000,000; and

Whereas there is no established policy for national defense, and therefore no guide as to what is needed by way of Military or Naval Establishments to assure such defense; and

Whereas the Government of the United States under the Pact of Paris renounced war as an instrument of national policy; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has declared its neutrality in the event of war between or among foreign nations; and

Whereas a fundamental principle of our democratic government as embodied in the Constitution is control of the military branches of the Government by the civilian authorities; and

Whereas the absence of a policy of national defense leads to inefficiency, uncoordinated activities of our Army and Navy, growing demands on the National Treasury to support an Army and Navy for unknown purposes, and results in misunderstanding both at home and abroad of the purposes of our Army and Navy: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That a special committee of civilians be appointed by the President of the United States and that the committee is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey of all the facts affecting the existing establishments of the Army and the Navy, to hold public hearings, and to recommend to the Congress of the United States a policy of national defense that shall be—

In harmony with our agreement to renounce war as an instrument of our national course in international affairs;

Designed only to defend the boundaries of the Nation against invasion;

Actually as well as theoretically in keeping with our neutrality laws;

Instrumental in insuring our peaceful relations with other nations of the world;

Conducive to the elimination from the defense establishments of all agencies designed, or primarily useful, for aggressive purposes; and

Determinative of a basic policy to guide expenditures for national defense so that the people in time of peace may not be burdened in the future by war appropriations fast exceeding \$1,000,000,000 annually.

Sec. 2. No member of the committee shall have any financial or economic interest in the production, distribution, or sale of materials used by the Army, Navy, or air forces of the United States; nor shall he hold any interest directly or indirectly in the sale, exchange, or transportation of articles, goods, or commodities to foreign nations; nor shall he have any financial or economic interest directly or indirectly in any foreign country.

Sec. 3. The committee shall be authorized to expend a sum of up to \$10,000 and to employ needed clerical help.

Sec. 4. A report shall be prepared not later than March 1, 1937, and presented to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. BENSON. Mr. President, one of the things that has been criticized in the Senate very frequently during the past few weeks has been the attitude of the newspapers of the country, their editorial policy and the unfair manner in which they handle news in their news columns. Newspapers have attacked Members of the Senate officially and unofficially. I recall reading Wednesday of this week an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News, which apparently endeavored to convey to its readers the idea that this country of ours is in grave danger of being attacked by some of our foreign neighbors.

It seems to me the fact that we have been appropriating large sums of money, hundreds of millions, yea, even billions of dollars for preparation for war, and that we continually read in the newspapers stories of the possibility of foreign countries, now at peace with us and friendly to us, attacking us sometime in the immediate future, is one of the reasons why it is very easy for the Congress to appropriate these huge sums of money. It seems to me it would be quite appropriate for the Congress to enact a law which would make it unlawful for newspapers or private citizens to disseminate false information with intent to incite our people to war or which would tend to lead our Government into war with other nations now at peace with us and friendly toward us. The violation of such a law should of course be made punishable in some appropriate manner.

Despite the fact that I know I shall be subject to criticism on the part of newspapers, I intend to introduce a bill to make it unlawful for a newspaper or an individual to disseminate false information which would tend to incite our people to unfriendly relations with other countries or which

would tend to incite our Government to war with such nations, and to make a violation of such law punishable by fine and imprisonment. The criticisms which probably will be leveled at the Congress for considering such a measure would involve the right of free speech, but I contend that, while we are at peace with other nations, it is just as vicious for a person to talk in such manner or print articles in such manner as to cause other nations to be unfriendly toward us and which would tend to lead us into war as it is during time of war for a citizen to talk against our own country while we are engaged in war. It seems to me the same penalties should be inflicted in each case.

Such a law is not without precedent. We have in this country laws protecting financial institutions against the issuance of false and untrue information, against the printing of such false and untrue information in newspapers when intended to harm such institutions. We even have laws in many of the States to protect the newspapers against persons who give them false information. So it seems to me it is entirely proper that our Government should have a law to protect it against those selfish individuals who would like to publish or print false information which would tend to stir our people or arouse our people to hatred toward other countries now on friendly terms with us.

I realize that it is useless to talk against the extravagant appropriation bill which is now before the Senate, but since next Sunday will be Mother's Day, and since it is a fact that the ladies of America are practically the only organized force in this country against war and for peace, it seems to be entirely appropriate for me to close my remarks with the ironic prayer for war of that great American, Mark Twain. I send to the desk, and ask permission to have read, the quotation from Mark Twain to which I refer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

MARK TWAIN'S IRONIC PRAYER FOR WAR

O Lord our God, help us to tear their soldiers to bloody shreds with our shells; help us to cover their smiling fields with the pale forms of their patriot dead; help us to drown the thunder of guns with the shrieks of the wounded, writhing in pain; help us to lay waste their humble homes with a hurricane of fire; help us to wring the hearts of their unoffending widows with unavailing grief; help us to turn them out roofless with their children to wander unfriended through wastes of their desolated land. For our sakes, who adore Thee, Lord, blast their hopes, blight their lives, protract their bitter pilgrimage, making heavy their steps, water their way with tears, stain the white snow with the blood of their wounded feet. We ask of One who is the spirit of love and who is the ever-faithful refuge and friend of all that are sore beset, and seek His aid with humble and contrite hearts. Grant our prayer, O Lord, and Thine shall be the praise and glory, now and forever. Amen.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on this bill I wish to mention the gratitude I feel to the committee investigating the munitions industry. I think they deserve a word of commendation at this time, when we are about to pass this great naval appropriation bill.

The members of the Munitions Investigating Committee labored long and arduously; and yet they must feel that in the present condition of the world, and the present warlike attitude of this country and its leadership, their work has been in vain. I cannot believe that it has been entirely in vain; but they have a right to believe it has been in vain when we see the present condition of the world, when we recall that men in public life in this country advocated sanctions and embargoes long before any government which had signed the Covenant of the League of Nations had agreed to sanctions, and when we see propagandists throughout the country, as we saw them from 1914 to 1917, spilling the poison that the people of the United States must continue, as they did in the last war, to meddle in the affairs and the squabbles of all European countries under the guise of asserting our moral leadership to help the good as against the bad.

Evidently, the world has learned nothing from the tragedy of the last war. As a matter of fact, the only tragedy many

persons saw in that war was the fact that a few laboring men were able to buy some silk shirts!

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief statement from an address made by me as to just what is the condition of our Army numerically compared with the armies of other countries, and the exact status of our Navy compared with the navies of other countries.

As the Senate is ready to vote, I do not care to take the time to answer some of the views expressed here, which I think, in view of the facts, are somewhat exaggerated. The figures submitted will speak for themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

How can we consider the broad questions of national defense in their concrete application to our own Government and our own Army and Navy and air forces today without dealing with actual facts rather than with theories?

The facts are that adequate national defense means today (1) a strong Navy and (2) a peacetime Army in terms of both Regulars and Reserves, which shall constitute a real basis of defense, and (3) a largely augmented air force in keeping with the tremendously expanding air forces of other nations. We are forging no weapons of attack, but we are urging potent weapons of defense. We are adhering to the doctrine that the way to insure peace is to be prepared against war—that by being strong to resist we shall have immunity from attack. Without taking further time in discussion of the reasons and circumstances which shape our present policy of national defense, I desire to tell you precisely where our Army and Navy stand today in comparison with those of other nations and precisely what it is proposed to do with respect to their further strengthening.

First, let us consider the United States Army, which is composed of three elements—the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves. The Regular Army consists at present of 12,000 officers and 140,000 enlisted men. These are our professional full-time soldiers. For reasons of economy the size of the standing Army has been kept at the lowest possible minimum. For a number of years up to last July there were only 118,000 enlisted men in the Army. The new Budget proposes an increase of 7,000, to 147,000, for the next fiscal year. The duties of the Regular Army include the defense of Hawaii, the Philippines, the Panama Canal, Puerto Rico, and Alaska. Nearly one-third of the Army is absent from the homeland on this duty. The Regular Army also must provide garrisons for our coast and harbor defenses, furnish a nucleus for rapid expansion in time of emergency, take charge of training our National Guard and Organized Reserves, and provide a force sufficiently strong to hold or repel an invader in the initial phases of war.

Our standing Army is one of the smallest of any country. It ranks about on a par with that of Turkey, and is smaller than the armies of such countries as Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Spain. Russia, for example, has a standing army of about a million and a quarter. Our National Guard is a civilian force organized under the States, and subject to call into the service of the Nation in time of emergency. The National Guard at present has an aggregate strength of approximately 200,000, which is less than half that authorized by the National Defense Act. In addition to the National Guard there are 85,000 civilians composing the Officers' Reserve Corps, who hold Reserve commissions in the Army and may be called to active duty in time of need.

Now, turning to the Navy, we find that it was not until 1933, 11 years after the Washington Naval Disarmament Conference, that we initiated any substantial naval building program. During these 11 years, while we were striving for disarmament by treaty, our own Navy stood still while all the other nations were strengthening and increasing their navies. During the period between 1922 and 1933 the British Navy laid down 394,000 tons of new naval craft and Japan laid 360,000 tons for her Navy, while the United States' total was 173,000 tons. As a consequence of this slowing down of our own naval building program in 1933 we had 351,000 tons of ships yet to be built under the London Naval Treaty of 1930. Our Navy, instead of being the equal of any navy in the world, was distinctly inferior.

But even our substantially inferior naval tonnage, compared with other naval powers, fails to reflect the inadequacy of our Navy. An actual comparison has to take into account a nation's merchant marine, which is available in case of war as a naval auxiliary. Much has been said about the development of an American merchant marine. I myself have been an earnest advocate of the development of a large merchant marine under the American flag, not simply for considerations of national defense, but as an agency for the promotion of American foreign trade. The fact is that we have no merchant marine worthy of the name, whereas Great Britain and other maritime nations have a large merchant marine, which is an additionally important element of their naval strength.

Our organized military forces comprise only one-third of 1 percent of our total population, and Italy has close to 15 percent of her population in arms, and even Sweden, a peace-loving nation, has organized military forces of 15 percent of her entire population.

The British Empire has 390,000 soldiers in active service and 632,000 in trained reserves and 46,000 in its separate air force. Germany has 426,000 soldiers in active service and trained reserves reported as 1,850,000. France has 600,000 men in her Regular Army and 5,500,000 in trained reserves and 34,000 in her separate air force. Italy has approximately 1,200,000 soldiers in active service and more than 5,000,000 in trained reserves and more than 200,000 in its separate air force. Japan has a standing army of 280,000 and active reserves of nearly 2,000,000. Spain reports a standing army of more than 200,000 and more than 2,000,000 in reserves. Poland, a standing army of more than 260,000 and nearly 1,500,000 in reserves.

Turning now to the Navy, President Coolidge, following the failure of the Geneva Disarmament Conference in 1926, took steps to correct appalling deficiencies in our own naval defense. Under President Hoover there was a suspension, but President Roosevelt has pushed forward new naval construction with the result that during 1933, 100,000 tons of ships were provided for. In 1934 there was laid down a total of 66,660 tons. There remains to be built a total of 51 vessels, comprising 36 destroyers and 15 submarines. But even at the present increased rate in naval building, it will not be until 1942, 6 years from now and 6 years after the expiration of and consequent abandonment of the existing naval disarmament treaties that the United States will have a Navy of treaty strength. In addition to the treaty strength, there is still a general class of ships required to round out the fleet and to make it a balanced whole, namely, tankers, repair ships, submarine tenders, hospital ships, and marine transports, which our own merchant marine is inadequate to supply.

Here are some interesting naval figures. As of today the United States has 16 large cruisers, Great Britain 19, and Japan 14. We have 10 small cruisers, Great Britain 36, and Japan 22. Italy has 11 battle cruisers and 17 smaller cruisers. Great Britain has six aircraft carriers with a 22,000-ton vessel now in process of construction, we have four, Japan has four.

Comparative total naval tonnage by no means accurately measures comparative naval strength. The speed of ships, their armament, and their obsolescence are all matters that have to be taken into account, and as matters now stand we still have some distance to go before we can truly say our own naval strength is second to none.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I have been informed that a committee representing the organization known as the People's Mandate to Governments called on the Senator in charge of the naval bill this morning to appeal for the immediate stopping of all increase of armaments and of armed forces. Of course, that applies to this bill. The heading of the petition is:

PEOPLE'S MANDATE TO GOVERNMENTS

We, the people, are determined to end war. War settles no problems. War brings economic disaster, needless suffering, and death to us and our children.

To meet the present threat of complete world chaos we demand that our Government, having renounced war in the Kellogg-Briand Pact, stop immediately all increase of armaments and of armed forces.

The ladies of the committee representing this organization claim to have a million signers to this petition.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, yesterday I offered an amendment, which was adopted, at page 36, line 6. I move to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was adopted, and offer as a substitute for it the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina moves to reconsider the vote by which the amendment, on page 36, line 6, was adopted.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the amendment heretofore agreed to it is proposed to insert:

The present incumbent, as attending physician at the Capitol, shall hereafter, while so serving, receive the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half and when retired his retired pay shall be computed on that basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FEDERAL AID FOR ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11687, to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11687) to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, at the end of section 1, page 3, after line 11, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(d) If within the fiscal years 1936 or 1937 the Secretary of Agriculture shall find with respect to any State that the proceeds of all special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation, as referred to in section 12 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 993), are applied to highway purposes as defined in said section, and shall further find that after having so applied such proceeds to such highway purposes other than construction there will be insufficient balance remaining for construction with which to match all, or any part, of the regular Federal-aid road funds apportioned to such State for either or both said years, respectively, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented, all, or such portion, of such apportionment as the State is unable to match shall be available for expenditure in such State in accordance with said Federal Highway Act without being matched by the State with State funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I believe it would be proper to make a brief explanation of the terms of the bill.

I have taken the trouble to prepare a rather elaborate report which explains in detail each section and provision of the bill and the purpose of all the amendments. At the conclusion of the report the situation is summarized as follows:

The total annual expenditures from the Federal Treasury as authorized by the bill are \$244,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1938 and 1939, made up as follows:

Regular Federal aid, \$125,000,000.

Which is the amount carried for the current fiscal year.

Forest highways, roads, and trails, \$20,000,000.

Which is twice the amount carried for the current fiscal year; but the evidence submitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads clearly demonstrates the necessity for the increase. Even with appropriations at this higher rate, it will take more than 15 years to construct the planned system of forest highways and approximately 30 years to complete the road and trail work to be done within the national forests.

The next item is:

Non-taxable public-land highways, \$2,500,000.

Which is the amount carried in the current law.

National park roads and trails, \$7,500,000.

That is the amount authorized for the present fiscal year.

There follows a new provision for national parkways, and the amount is \$10,000,000 a year. To date two great parkways have been established—one to connect the Shenandoah National Park with the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, extending through Virginia and North Carolina; another is known as the Natchez Trace in Tennessee and Mississippi. This is a new but a highly desirable activity of the National Park Service.

Indian reservation roads, \$4,000,000.

Which is the sum at present authorized.

Secondary or feeder roads, \$25,000,000.

This is a new departure, but entirely justified if a serious and sustained effort is made to get the farmer out of the mud.

In the years to come work on the secondary or farm-to-market roads will undoubtedly be expanded as the trunk-line highways are completed. There is a necessity for change in the statutes of the various States to permit a number of the State highway departments to supervise the construction of that type of roads. This bill authorizes a modest appropriation, with the idea that the need for changing State laws may be brought to the attention of the State legislatures when they convene next year.

The next item is for the elimination of grade crossings—\$50,000,000. Unlike the appropriation for primary or secondary roads, this sum need not be matched by the States, and properly so, because the States are put to a great burden of expense in acquiring property rights and paying property damages in the centers of population where underpasses or overpasses are built. In addition to that, the railroads provide valuable engineering assistance and rights-of-way.

The total sum is \$244,000,000, authorized by the bill to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1938 and 1939.

It is interesting to note that since the Federal Government undertook to aid the States in the construction of highways, 20 years ago, under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1916 there has been expended from the Federal Treasury over \$1,987,000,000. Within that same period there has been collected by Federal taxation from those who use the roads a sum total of \$2,033,000,000. In other words, in the past two decades those who use the roads have paid Federal taxes amounting to more than the total Federal expenditures for highway purposes.

At the close of the report is shown an even more remarkable set of figures for the past three years and a half. For the fiscal years 1933, 1934, and 1935, and for the present fiscal year up to March 31, 1936, there have been expended the largest sums of money ever appropriated by Congress toward highway construction, a total of \$829,000,000. Yet, during the same period there has been collected from those who used the highways a total of \$958,000,000. In other words, there has been collected \$128,000,000 more than has been disbursed, even at this highly accelerated rate of expenditure.

It may therefore be properly asserted that if a principle is to be followed which we all believe to be sound, that moneys collected from the users of the highways should be expended upon the highways, there has been diversion of Federal funds to the extent of \$128,000,000 from 1933 to date.

There is great complaint throughout the United States respecting the diversion of highway funds, which has taken place at an increasing rate, not upon the part of the Federal Government but by the States. A rule was established when the gasoline tax was first imposed by the States, that practically all of the collections from that tax, the tax on oil and on motor vehicles of all kinds, should be expended on building or maintaining highways. In 1925 only \$14,000,000 was diverted for other than highway purposes in all of the States. Within the next 10 years the policy of diversion was so advanced that by 1934 over \$125,000,000 was diverted to other than road uses. In other words, the diversion increased tenfold in 10 years. On the authority of the National Highway Users Conference, I make the statement that there was enough money diverted from the gasoline tax and like sources to other uses in the States in the year 1934 to build a high type of highway from New York to San Francisco, another from Chicago to New Orleans, and a third from New York to Jacksonville, Fla. Three great highways of that type could have been constructed with the money that was taken away from the users of the roads and diverted to other than highway purposes by the States.

It is a sound proposition that if the Federal Government is to tax the users of highways, Congress should direct that what is collected from that source shall be used on the highways. If the revenue so obtained is not spent upon the highways, it should not be diverted to other uses, but the Federal taxes upon gasoline and motor vehicles of every kind should be correspondingly reduced.

The report shows the sources of the revenue collected from those who used the roads during the calendar year 1935. They are as follows:

Lubricating oils, \$28,000,000; gasoline, \$172,000,000; transportation of oil by pipe line, \$9,000,000; crude petroleum, \$1,600,000; automobile trucks, \$6,600,000.

The tax on automobiles and motorcycles produced \$42,000,000; the tax on parts and accessories produced \$7,000,000; on tires, \$22,000,000; on inner tubes, \$5,000,000.

The total collection for the calendar year 1935 amounted to \$296,000,000.

The bill authorizes expenditures for the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 amounting to \$244,000,000. While it is true that all of the money collected in the form of the gasoline tax and other taxes on motor transportation does not come from the users of the roads, because a certain amount of gasoline and oil are used in stationary engines and elsewhere, yet there is a margin of between 50 and 60 million dollars a year between what may be clearly anticipated as the total revenue, and the total expenditures authorized by the bill. I say that advisedly, because the records show there are being purchased each year about 3,000,000 new automobiles and trucks. Some of them, of course, are to replace machines now being worn out, but each year there is an increase in the number of motor vehicles on the roads.

There are at present about 26,000,000 automobiles and trucks in use in the United States, and with a continuous increase in the number of motor vehicles on the roads, we have every right to expect that at the present rates of Federal taxation over \$300,000,000 a year will be placed in the Treasury. The bill authorizes expenditures to the extent of \$244,000,000.

Therefore, it can be truly said that the bill represents a fair return to the motorist, to the user of the road, for the money he pays in taxation to the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. POPE in the chair]. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 2, on page 4, line 10, to strike out "\$10,000,000 and to insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000"; on line 11, to strike out "\$10,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000"; and on line 12, after the numerals "1939", to insert the following proviso: "Provided, That one-third, but not less than \$3,000,000, of the appropriation made for any fiscal year for carrying out the provisions of said section 23 may hereafter be expended for the purposes enumerated in the first paragraph of clause (a) of said section 23: *And provided further*, That on or before January 1 of each year the Secretary of Agriculture shall apportion and prorate among the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, as provided in said section 23, the sum authorized for the fiscal year immediately following and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to approve projects under any such apportionment, and to incur obligations or enter into contracts under his apportionment and prorating of the authorization, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation on the part of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof", so as to make the section read:

Sec. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for forest highways, roads, and trails the following sums, to be available until expended in accordance with the provisions of said section 23: The sum of \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938; the sum of \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939: *Provided*, That one-third, but not less than \$3,000,000, of the appropriation made for any fiscal year for carrying out the provisions of said section 23 may hereafter be expended for the purposes enumerated in the first paragraph of clause (a) of said section 23: *And provided further*, That on or before January 1 of each year the Secretary of Agriculture shall apportion and prorate among the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, as provided in said section 23, the sum authorized for the fiscal year immediately following and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to approve projects under any such apportionment, and to incur obligations or enter into contracts under his apportionment and prorating of the authorization, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation on the part of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 6, line 1, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 5. For the construction and maintenance of parkways, to give access to national parks, or to become connecting sections of a national parkway plan, over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States by the States or by private individuals, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939: *Provided*, That the location of such parkways upon public lands, national forests, or other Federal reservations shall be determined by agreement between the department having jurisdiction over such lands and the National Park Service.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on line 2, after the word "parks", to insert the words "and national monuments", so as to read:

For the construction and maintenance of parkways, to give access to national parks and national monuments—

And so forth. I offer the amendment so that the bill may conform to the report.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 6, after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 6. For construction and improvement of Indian reservation roads under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and the sum of \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at the end of section 6, page 6, I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed amendment to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 18, after the figures "1939", it is proposed to add the following proviso:

: *Provided*, That hereafter the location, type, and design of all roads constructed under the provisions of said act of May 26, 1928, shall be approved by the Bureau of Public Roads before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction done by contract shall be under the general supervision of said Bureau.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the text of the amendment I am offering is a reproduction of a proviso contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1935, where the appropriation for Indian reservation roads was made. The idea is that there should be the same supervision afforded and the same advice given to the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the construction of roads on Indian reservations as the Bureau of Public Roads extends to States in making their expenditures.

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendment, then, applies to the construction of highways on Indian reservations?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; and only to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 7, on page 7, line 3, after the word "routes", to strike out the words "*Provided further*, That there shall be established in the Bureau of Public Roads a section of rural roads, subject to the direction of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads", so as to make the section read:

Sec. 7. In addition to any other authorizations which have been made, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the several States to be apportioned and expended under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented: The sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938; the sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939: *Provided*, That the sums herein authorized shall be applied to secondary or feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail roads, and public-school bus routes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 8, on page 8, line 3, after the numerals "1939", to insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the appropriations hereafter made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, or any acts amend-

tory thereof or supplementary thereto, shall be approved for expenditure on any highway unless proper safety protective devices shall be installed or be in operation at any highway and railroad grade crossing or drawbridge on that portion of the highway with respect to which such expenditures are to be made and said devices shall comply with the safety standards determined by the United States Bureau of Public Roads at that time as being adequate", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. For the elimination of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, including the separation or protection of grades at crossings, the reconstruction of existing railroad grade-crossing structures, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be apportioned on or before the 1st day of January of each year preceding the fiscal year for which it is authorized among the several States (including the Territory of Hawaii and the District of Columbia) in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented, except that such apportionment shall be one-half on population as shown by the latest decennial census, one-fourth on the mileage of the Federal-aid highway system as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and one-fourth on the railroad mileage as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to be expended in accordance with said Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, except that no part of such funds apportioned to any State need be matched by the State: The sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938; the sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations hereafter made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, or any acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, shall be approved for expenditure on any highway unless proper safety protective devices shall be installed or be in operation at any highway and railroad grade crossing or drawbridge on that portion of the highway with respect to which such expenditures are to be made and said devices shall comply with the safety standards determined by the United States Bureau of Public Roads at that time as being adequate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 9, on page 8, line 17, to strike out "1, 5, and 6" and to insert in lieu thereof "1, 7, and 8", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. With the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, not to exceed 1½ percent of the amount apportioned for any year to any State under sections 1, 7, and 8 of this act may be used for surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations of projects for future construction in such State, either on the Federal-aid highway system and extensions thereof or on secondary or feeder roads.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the section numbers may be changed to conform to the amendments made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will make the necessary changes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, after line 14, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 10. Every contract for the construction or repair of any highway growing out of an appropriation of Federal funds made under this act, heretofore made or hereafter to be made, shall contain a provision that in the performance of the work the contractor, subcontractors, materialmen, or suppliers shall use only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States. The fact that articles, materials, or supplies have been produced or manufactured in this country from articles, materials, or supplies which have been imported into this country shall not make them eligible for use in the performance of any such contract. This section shall not apply to articles, materials, or supplies which are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality: *Provided, however*, That before the use of any such imported articles, materials, or supplies is authorized under any contract the head of the department or the independent establishment making a contract for such imported supplies shall give public notice that

such an exemption is being contemplated, and after due opportunity has been given for domestic suppliers of such articles, materials, or supplies to be heard, a public record shall be made of the findings which justify such exemption.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the pending Federal-aid highway bill, being House bill 11687, providing for appropriations aggregating \$236,500,000 for each of the years 1938 and 1939, will provide important markets for asphalt. Most of the asphalt used in highway construction is made from petroleum. The United States produces about 60 percent of the total world production of petroleum. In spite of this, the United States is importing about 50 percent of the asphalt or asphalt-bearing oils used in this country from other nations whose total production is slightly over 10 percent of the world production. These imports are brought into this country by a small number of importing concerns.

From the various types of crude oil produced in this country, asphalts of almost every quality are manufactured. Road asphalt made from domestic petroleum is available in large quantities. Evidence submitted to the Fact Finding Committee of the Planning and Coordination Committee under the Petroleum Code meeting with the representatives of the Administrative Board has shown that road asphalt produced from this domestic oil is of the highest quality. Such difference in prices as might exist between the domestic and foreign products is very small; and since the cost of the asphalt in any mile of highway is not one of the major items, this slightly increased cost would not greatly increase the total cost of the road built from this asphalt.

The cost of the domestic product is not entirely due to the production nor the manufacturing cost, but is also due to royalties and lease payments made to farmers and landowners and distributed to large numbers of persons in this country. Another portion of the slightly higher cost of the domestic product is due to the American wage scale, which does not prevail in Mexico nor in Venezuela, from which come nearly the entire importation of foreign asphalt or foreign asphaltic oils.

The intent of Congress in the adoption of many emergency construction or relief measures has been clearly expressed. The purpose has been announced to give the largest amount of employment to American labor and to give the largest amount of opportunity to American industry, in order that the purchasing power of the American people might be increased. If an industry like the domestic asphalt industry is to be penalized through loss of potential Government contracts to the slightly cheaper foreign asphalt because of its higher labor costs, then seemingly the only remedy would be to reduce wages and increase hours of labor. Such a suggestion reduces to an absurdity the argument that the lower-priced product should be used even if it is of foreign origin. If this theory were generally adopted, much of the labor which has been put to work during the past 3 years would still be unemployed, since great quantities of the various materials used in the various kinds of construction work undertaken by the Federal Government or with its aid could have been obtained in foreign countries at lower cost than the domestic product.

A large number of petroleum refineries have closed their plants and gone out of business during the past few years. Many of these would still be in operation if imported asphalt, or asphalt made from imported petroleum, had not taken the place of domestic asphalt which could have been produced at these refineries. On the other hand, those refineries which are today producing asphalt in this country from foreign petroleum would still use the same employees if domestic crude oil instead of foreign crude oil were used. The same operations would be required and the same amount of labor would be necessary. All the difference would be that American companies and American workers would produce the crude petroleum from which the asphalt is made. Of course there would be one other difference. Those importers who are today bringing in the cheaper foreign petroleum would not make such large profits if they were forced to use the domestic petroleum.

Since the asphalt of the domestic petroleum industry has suffered because of foreign asphalt, or asphalt produced from foreign oils, being granted exemption from the provisions of acts requiring the use of domestic materials or the products of domestic manufacture, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, which includes nearly all the small producers of the Middle West and Western States, urges this amendment to the Federal Highway Act now before the Senate. This amendment is intended to make effective an intent which Congress has several times expressed in the past, that domestic industry and domestic labor shall be aided and encouraged in the expenditures of these large Federal appropriations whose primary intent, it is generally understood, is to increase employment and to enlarge the purchasing power of the American people.

The suggested amendment follows the general language of the so-called Domestic Origins Act, except that the following sentence has been added:

The fact that articles, materials, or supplies have been produced or manufactured in this country from articles, materials, or supplies which have been imported into this country shall not make them eligible for use in the performance of any such contract.

The language used in the Domestic Origins Act has also been altered so that when exemptions are made, the head of the department or independent establishment making such exemption can do so only in the case of articles, materials, and supplies which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States in sufficient or reasonably available commercial quantities and of a sufficient quality. This amendment also provides that when such an exemption is being contemplated public notice shall be given and domestic suppliers shall be given due opportunity to be heard, and a public record made of the findings deemed to justify such exemption.

The domestic asphalt industry has suffered severely because of various exemptions made to most of the regulations requiring the use of domestic material in construction work under emergency Federal appropriations.

Russell Brown, representing the Independent Petroleum Association, recently made a statement to the House Committee on Roads in which he said:

No convincing information has to date been given defining the question as to how it was not practicable to require the use of asphalt produced from domestic crude; neither have any figures been offered, to the best of our information, showing how or where the use of domestic asphalt would unreasonably increase the cost of highway construction. This exemption in favor of the foreign asphalt and discriminating in effect against the domestic product has continued in force to this time. The Domestic Origins Act, so-called, is actually title III of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, approved March 3, 1933. This title specifically requires the use of "only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies, as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States."

In spite of this clear provision of the law, the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department in its Procurement Bulletin SPO-20, issued September 4, 1935, cited a certificate signed by the Secretary of the Treasury under date of August 27, as follows:

"... authority is hereby given to purchase, when required, asphalt made from foreign crude oil, the processing of which is done in the United States of American companies employing American citizens and using American capital."

Under this ruling of the Treasury Department, bids have been awarded to contractors using foreign asphalt where the difference in price between the foreign and domestic product was very slight. It has been stated a number of times without any contradiction that in at least one instance, this difference of cost, presumably an "unreasonable difference", was one-hundredth of a cent.

Mr. President, the United States has an abundance of petroleum capable of making any and all petroleum products necessary to domestic consumption; and the injection of foreign petroleum into our market must of necessity reduce the amount of oil that can be consumed domestically in proportion to the amount that is imported. The domestic petroleum industry carries a very heavy burden of both State and Federal taxes, from which the foreign industry is free, and is thus contributing materially to the welfare of our

Government. It is not fair that the laborer employed in this industry should be forced to remain idle while foreign labor is employed to produce petroleum products to enter into competition with our domestic oils.

For these reasons, I respectfully present the amendment to the Senate for its consideration, and urge that it be incorporated in the Federal-aid highway bill for the promotion of domestic industry and the employment of American labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, after careful consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, decided not to report it favorably. The amendment has been before the Senate for some time in the shape of a bill presented by the Senator from Kansas.

A few days ago I received a letter from the Department of State. It is dated May 7, 1936, is signed by the Secretary of State, and is as follows:

MAY 7, 1936.

The Honorable KENNETH McKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: I wish to transmit herewith a copy of a memorandum dated May 5, 1936, which has been presented to the Department of State by the Mexican Embassy, with reference to an amendment introduced by Senator CAPPER on the calendar day April 29, 1936, to the bill H. R. 11687.

This amendment would require a provision in every contract for construction or repair of any highway growing out of an appropriation of Federal funds made under the Federal Aid Highway Act that there shall be used only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States. It is my understanding that this amendment would mainly affect the use of asphalt produced from imported crude petroleum.

I assume that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which this amendment has been referred, will wish to give full consideration to its possible effects upon our trade relations, particularly with Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru, as well as to aspects of domestic policy which may be involved.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Attached to the letter which I have just read, which was addressed to me, is the memorandum to which the Secretary referred, which is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

The Mexican Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State, and takes the liberty of calling the attention of the Department to the following situation:

The Federal Aid Highways Act, now being considered by the Senate, provides large appropriations for the construction of highways in 1937 and 1938.

At present and for many years past the highways of the United States have been constructed of asphalt made from the crude oil imported from Mexico. In fact, all imports of crude oil from Mexico are converted into paving asphalt.

The western producers of domestic crude oil have tried to prohibit the use of this superior grade of asphalt in public works without success. Their last attempt is incorporated in the amendment presented by Senator CAPPER (copy attached), which in lines 3 to 7, of page 2, provides that no materials manufactured from imported products shall be used in roads.

The result of the enactment of this amendment would be that asphalt manufactured from Mexican crude oil could not be used in public works in the United States. Importations of Mexican crude oil would naturally be diminished or probably terminated.

Furthermore, the amendment would constitute a barrier against commerce of exactly the nature which Secretary Hull deprecates.

The Mexican Embassy thanks the Department of State for the attention it might give to this matter.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 5, 1936.

Mr. President, I think it should be said that about half of the crude oil used for roads comes from abroad and about half from this country. Some petroleum fields, I am informed, produce a crude product that is fit for making asphalt used in the construction of roads, while that is not true of the product of other fields. I am informed that the product of the Kansas oil field does not furnish much asphalt for use in road construction. There are differences in oils throughout the country. At any rate, under these circumstances, your committee thought that it was proper not to adopt this amendment, and I hope it will not be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am not opposed to this amendment for any of the reasons indicated by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], for I heartily concur in the basic thesis of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Capper] respecting complete and absolute preference for American production wherever possible; but there seems to be another question involved in this particular amendment, and, after all, this is a road bill, as I understand, and not a tariff bill.

The State Highway Commissioner of Michigan, Mr. Murray Van Wagoner, telegraphs the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Couzens] and myself as follows—and I call the attention of the Senator from Kansas to this statement:

Defeat of this amendment is essential for the continued use of high-quality asphalt products in the State of Michigan.

Apparently it appears to be the opinion of the State highway commissioner—and he also asserts in the telegram that this is the experience both of his administration and the preceding State highway administration in Michigan—that he cannot build the kind of roads he wants to build unless he can have what he calls high-quality asphalt which apparently the terms of this amendment would proscribe. What has the Senator from Kansas to say about that?

Mr. CAPPER. I know that large quantities of domestic asphalt are being used, and I have heard no complaint as to the quality of the asphalt. The domestic producers insist they can supply a material that will meet every requirement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So far as the oil factor of the equation in Michigan is concerned, I think I should probably add from the State highway commissioner's telegram the following:

This does not affect Michigan oil industry, as asphalt made from Michigan crudes is not suitable for paving purposes.

This is apparently another of those situations such as the one to which the Senator from Tennessee is referring.

Now, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona, who is the best authority I know of not only on the subject of getting appropriations [laughter], but also on the subject of building roads, whether there is any dependable information conclusively available on the question raised by the State highway commissioner of Michigan?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the best information that I have is based upon data furnished by the chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, and a report from the Secretary of Agriculture, both adverse to this proposal.

This same question was before the Bureau of Public Roads on another occasion, and was decided adversely to those who favor this amendment. The findings of the Bureau were:

That a requirement that all asphaltic material for highway work be produced from domestic crude will unreasonably increase the cost of such materials in a considerable portion of the United States.

That with the exception of the importation of some foreign crude by certain east-coast refineries, asphaltic highway materials are largely byproducts of the oil refining industry.

In other words, the materials are byproducts of American industry.

That asphaltic materials constitute only a minor fraction of the output of the oil industry considered as a whole.

That approximately 60 percent of the asphalt manufactured at refineries in the United States in 1932 was used for road and street work.

That approximately 55 percent of the asphalt manufactured in the United States in 1932 was from foreign crude.

Refineries on the Atlantic seaboard accounted for between 85 and 90 percent of the asphalt produced from foreign crude. This asphalt was used principally in supplying the territory adjacent to the eastern seaport, and it is this territory which would be most adversely affected by a requirement to use only asphaltic highway materials produced from domestic crude.

In support of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads that midcontinent crudes do not provide a material satisfactory for road-making purposes, I should like to read a paragraph from a letter from Warren Bros. Roads Co., the largest independent or-

ganization engaged in street paving in the United States, which states:

This company, the most extensive user of petroleum asphalt for paving, has for 30 years conducted research into the quality and uses of asphalt. The results of our laboratory research make it necessary that we require on our guaranteed pavements the asphalt produced from full asphaltic base oils and cannot accept paraffin or semiasphaltic base oils for construction. California, Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela produce decidedly superior crudes as compared with the now so-called midcontinent fields, and it is essential that sufficient high-grade crudes be made available at the refineries to localize production of these best grades and to head off high price advances and long transportation costs.

The same statement is repeated by the Granite Bituminous Paving Co. of St. Louis, Mo., from whose letter I quote, as follows:

We have found that there are some domestic asphalts that are of high quality, such as asphalt refined from California crudes, but we also know that there are midcontinent crudes which do not produce a high-grade asphalt material.

The Corps of Engineers also finds that in the use of asphalt in connection with river and harbor work midcontinent crudes cannot be depended upon to supply a binder that is as satisfactory as the California or Mexican or Venezuelan crudes. General Markham says:

While there appears to be some difference of opinion as to the relative merits of asphalt produced from domestic and foreign crudes in highway construction work, there is a consensus of opinion that asphalts manufactured from Mexican and South American crudes possess superior qualities particularly desirable to the exacting requirements of river revetment work.

There is no question that if a specification requires the use of the best kind of a binder for highway work, as should be the case if we want to build the best kind of roads, probably the only place in the United States where suitable asphaltic material can be obtained is California. The Pennsylvania and midcontinent fields cannot supply the kind of asphaltic highway materials desired.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, as I understand the Senator, he thinks the protest of the State highway commissioner of Michigan is probably justified?

Mr. HAYDEN. The protest read by the Senator from Michigan is fully verified and sustained by the information furnished by the Bureau of Public Roads.

I therefore hope, Mr. President, that the amendment may not be adopted.

I should like to include in the RECORD, if I may, a protest against the amendment signed by the American Motorists' Association, which goes into the matter in some detail.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 7, 1936.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: The American Motorists' Association wishes to protest the adoption of the amendment to H. R. 11687 by the distinguished Senator Capper, for the following reasons:

1. It is a tariff proposal and not germane to the Federal Aid Highway Act.
 2. It would prohibit the use of asphalt manufactured in the United States from imported crude oil.
 3. It is not in the interest of the conservation of our natural resources.
 4. It will create an asphalt monopoly. The United States Treasury Department reports that the Standard Oil Co. of California controls the only American wells pumping the heavy grade crude oil convertible into asphalt, economically marketable in the East.
 5. The use of asphalt manufactured from domestic crude oil only will greatly increase the cost of asphaltic materials, resulting in a greatly reduced road-building program and the consequent employment of fewer men.
 6. The forced increase in asphalt prices will serve to justify increased cement prices.
 7. It would create delays, confusion, and other dangers attendant to a change in the accepted and established highway specifications of many municipalities, counties, and State highway departments.
- The American Motorists' Association is composed of automobile clubs representing many thousands of automobile owners. These members and other highway users through direct taxation have financed the entire Federal highway building program since its inception in 1916, and we respectfully urge that the United States Senate do not enact the amendment proposed.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN MOTORISTS ASSOCIATION,
THOMAS J. KEEFE, General Manager.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like to go on record as opposing this amendment for another reason—namely, that it seems to me to involve a very narrow national policy and one which, if carried out to its logical conclusion, would establish the complete isolation of the United States. This is not a tariff, this is not a protective measure or a revenue measure. It appears to be an absolute embargo; and if other countries should assume a similar attitude, the workmen in the United States would pay the bill, because, of all countries in the world, the United States possesses the greatest abundance of resources, materials, and manufactures, and the ultimate penalty would fall upon the American workmen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations on this amendment. It seems to me that at a time when we are trying to create employment for the unemployed in this country it would be a great mistake not to protect as far as possible, by legislation, American industries engaged in producing the very things that must be absorbed in this country to carry on necessary public works.

It has been suggested that only California produces the kind of crude oil from which these necessary materials for road building are made. Suppose that should be true; California is a part of America, and the production of the materials in California, involving a large amount of employment, will result in taking off the relief rolls just that many more men. I feel that we ought in all these cases to give preferential treatment to what is produced in the United States, especially in the present emergency.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McADOO. I yield.

Mr. DUFFY. Does the Senator think that California produces enough of a superior quality of crude to supply the normal demand in this country for the higher grade of asphalt used for road improvements?

Mr. McADOO. I have not the present figures of production in California, but I will say that if California does not produce enough, she can do so if given a chance. We have plenty of reserves, ample reserves to supply all that may be needed in this country for road building. I am not making this argument solely for California; I am making it for every American industry involved. I think our first duty is to give our own people the opportunity to get employment instead of keeping them on the relief rolls.

Which is cheaper in the actual money cost involved, I do not know, because I have not the figures, but, in my humble judgment, it will cost much more to keep the unemployed on the relief rolls than it will to pay a little higher price for the necessary materials used in road construction and thereby employ American labor and American enterprise.

Mr. President, the amendment relates not only to oil, but to manufactured articles of all kinds required in the construction of roads and highways. There are many collateral things required in such construction. I think the amendment would be of pronounced benefit for the country in stimulating the production of other things required in road construction, which would cause an additional demand for labor and would take that many more people off the relief rolls. The amendment ought to be adopted. I am in favor of giving America the preference. I am not in favor of giving foreign nations a superior opportunity to American enterprise in the matter of things needed for domestic construction and for domestic use.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word or two on the amendment. My distinguished friend from California [Mr. McAdoo], who was born in Georgia and now lives in the great State of California, seems to overlook the fact that there are sections of the country which would be very heavily penalized if the amendment should be adopted. It is referred to as an amendment which includes materials other than asphalt, but the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAP-

PER] made no mistake about it. He confined his remarks to American asphalt or petroleum.

Mr. President, along the Atlantic seaboard there are a number of valuable and highly capitalized enterprises employing large numbers of men who would be thrown out of employment and forced to go on the relief rolls if we had to import our asphalt or the material for it from the far distant State of California, particularly if we had to pay the price which would induce a volume production twice as great as the present production.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, will my distinguished friend from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McADOO. May I ask the Senator if he does not think that, so far as expense is concerned, it would cost practically the same to bring petroleum, for the purposes we are considering, in ships or tankers from California as from Venezuela and Mexico?

Mr. GEORGE. No; it would not.

Mr. McADOO. Does not the Senator think the amount of oil which could be shipped in that way from California would keep just as many men employed in the factories along the eastern seaboard as if the oil were brought from Mexico or Venezuela or from some other foreign country?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not. The crude oil produced in this country suited for a high-grade asphalt will supply only about 50 percent of the demand. If we should adopt measures of this kind, tacked on to a road-building-program bill, without any consideration of its effect upon the commerce and trade of the Nation, if we should pursue this piecemeal, illogical method of dealing with the vital question of the commerce of the Nation without regard to the hardships put upon half of the country, necessarily it would, of course, increase the price of this character of oil, because, if we are now producing only one-half of the crude oil which will make the high-grade asphalt demanded and necessary for use in this country, it stands to reason, in an industry which is already overproducing and which has been here time after time asking for higher tariffs and restrictions on production, that we would again overstimulate the production of crude oil.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. McADOO. I should like to correct the Senator's impression that California is at present overproducing oil. California has been on a quota for some time under regulations which have heretofore been prescribed and which have been observed voluntarily. I repeat that if California had the opportunity of supplying the demands of this country undoubtedly they could be supplied, and at prices which would be less for the American people to pay, and Georgia in particular, than to continue to import a large part of this necessary product and keep men on the relief roll of the Federal Government.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am surprised at my distinguished friend. There is no possible argument on its merits for this proposal. In the first place, the adoption of such an amendment would throw out of employment more men and more families by closing up the refineries on the eastern seaboard. In the second place, the present supply will not meet more than one-half the demand. Everybody knows the producers are on a quota and are repeatedly coming here for tariffs. We have given them tariffs and higher tariffs until now all along the seaboard we are paying a great tribute to the oil-producing States.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to listen to my friend from California.

Mr. McADOO. We are paying tribute to the cotton States, too. The Senator was good enough to say I was born in Georgia. Naturally, I am in sympathy with cotton planters in that section of the country. But why should not that

principle apply just as well to oil in California as to cotton in the cotton-producing States? The same principle should work both ways. We have to pay more in California for the cotton goods we consume because we want to help Georgia. I think Georgia ought to help California by giving us an opportunity to produce a sufficient amount of oil, as we have the capacity to do, to take care of their needs along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not aware of any special favors being shown cotton, and I am not asking for any, so far as that is concerned. I am only asking that special favors be not shown to a material which is needed to make our improvements, which would be greatly advanced in cost if this provision should be included in the bill, where it has no possible proper place, as it seems to me, because, if it is inserted at all, it is without consideration of those very much broader questions which affect so vitally so many people of the country, and without any regard as to how it affects them.

I am not unwilling to help California or any other American community, but the facts are that California has no difficulty in selling her crude oil from which is produced the high-quality asphalt used in this country. In fact, she supplies approximately one half of the demand. The other half comes from Mexico or some of the nearby South American countries. We have found from actual experience that we must have this crude oil either from South America or from California, which can only meet one-half of the present demand. It seems to me there should be no just complaint when we consider the size of the tariff we have permitted to be imposed or helped to impose on the oil imports from other competing countries. I very well remember when the last tariff bill was under consideration it was made to appear here that the average competitive advantage of imported crude oil was about 19 cents, and we put on a tariff of 21 cents, as I recollect, which certainly ought to have wiped out that competitive advantage to the foreign producer.

The situation is simply that we do not produce in this country sufficient crude oil from which can be made the high-quality asphalt to meet more than one-half of our consumptive demands. It so happens that production is on the west coast. It so happens that even if California produced enough, the cost of freight to the eastern seaports would, of course, be disastrously high.

While the water transportation would be somewhat cheaper, yet, considering the total transportation costs, from the field to the ports and from the ports on the eastern seaboard to the inland places, towns and cities and country roads where the asphalt must be used, we would still be at a very great disadvantage on the eastern seaboard, and we would suffer actual displacement of American labor if this amendment were incorporated in the bill.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the amendment will not be adopted. If there is not an adequate tariff on foreign oil, let us consider that subject in some measure having to do with our trade and commerce, and the proper protection of American commerce. Let us not vastly increase the cost all along the eastern seaboard of the necessary work of paving our streets and highways, at the same time displacing and throwing into idleness quite a large number of laborers, and jeopardizing quite a large investment in refineries along the seaboard.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, for the Record I think I should read a letter written by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with respect to this amendment. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1936.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 1 to which was attached a copy of an amendment intended to be proposed by Senator CAPPER to H. R. 11687.

This proposed amendment would add a new section to H. R. 11687 as it passed the House on April 16, 1936, to be designated section 8, and would require every contract for the construction or repair of any highway growing out of an appropriation of Fed-

eral funds to contain a provision which would practically exclude the use of any other than domestic materials in the performance of such contract.

The provision which the amendment proposes would be much more stringent than the so-called buy-American provisions contained in title III of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1934, approved March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520).

It is the Department's view that the existing law on this subject affords adequate protection to the domestic producers of materials for use in the highway-construction field, and that the enactment of the amendment is not only unnecessary but would constitute an unwarranted discrimination against the manufacture and use of road materials. The Department therefore recommends against favorable action on the proposed amendment.

Sincerely,

W. B. GREGG, Acting Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be offered, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted on April 30 at a meeting held in Phoenix, Ariz., of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, representing the 11 Western States. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS AT THE ANNUAL MEETING IN PHOENIX, ARIZ., APRIL 30, 1936

Whereas this conference views with alarm the continued sale of motor vehicle fuels on Government military and other reservations, upon which no State tax has been collected, such tax-free fuel being used on the public highways; and

Whereas the various States have no remedy under existing laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference pledge its support to a bill now before Congress (H. R. 3660) sponsored by the North American Gasoline Tax Conference, which, if enacted, will confer upon the several States authority to collect motor vehicle fuel taxes on all sales made on such reservations other than to the United States Government or its agencies.

The bill, House bill 3660, to which the resolution makes reference was introduced by Mr. WOODRUM, of Virginia. I obtained a copy of it, and submitted it yesterday to the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads. He tells me that there is complaint in many parts of the country about the inability of the States to collect revenue on gasoline sold on Government reservations not for governmental use. I desire to submit the matter to the Senate by offering an amendment which is the exact text of the House bill.

I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 10. (a) That all taxes levied by any State upon sales of gasoline and other motor-vehicle fuels may be levied, in the same manner and to the same extent, upon such fuels when sold by or through post exchanges, ship stores, ship-service stores, commissaries, or other similar agencies, located on United States military or other reservations, when such fuels are used for other than governmental purposes. Such taxes, so levied, shall be paid to the proper taxing authorities of the State within whose borders the reservation affected may be located.

(b) The officer in charge of such reservation shall, on the first day of each month, submit a written statement to the proper taxing authorities of the State within whose borders the reservation is located showing the exact amount of such motor fuels sold for other than governmental purposes during the preceding month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GEORGE] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 3, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided further, That in carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, during the fiscal years 1936 and 1937, deal directly with the authorities in the counties or other subdivisions of the several States having

supervision of the construction of roads of the classes specified in this section, and for such purpose to approve projects, make contracts, and exercise any other functions performed through the Bureau of Public Roads under the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as appears from the reading of this amendment, it is purely permissive, and leaves in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture the matter of dealing with any agency of the State government other than the highway departments of the several States. The amendment relates only to the section of the bill which appropriates funds for the construction of secondary or feeder roads.

Unless this amendment be adopted, there is likely to be considerable confusion in the administration of the fund provided for improvement of secondary or feeder roads. In a great many of the States it would require action by the legislatures of the several States to confer on the State highway departments any jurisdiction or power over any roads other than those already embraced in the State highway systems. A great many legislatures do not meet until next year or the year following. The title to all these local secondary and feeder roads in most of the States is at present in the local administrative bodies.

Occasions might arise where some States would be delayed for a year or more in the expenditure of their portion of this secondary road fund unless this amendment should be adopted, and the Secretary of Agriculture should be permitted to deal with the local bodies. As I said, the State highway departments in several States, including my own State, have no jurisdiction whatever save over roads that have already been taken into the State highway system by act of the general assembly; and that condition would at least delay the application of this bill for paving and improving these secondary or feeder roads.

I feel quite sure that we are all concerned to see this movement succeed. I think this is the first time the proposal has appeared in a measure of this kind for secondary or feeder roads. We have expended huge sums of money on various State highway systems, and as a matter of fact the Federal Government is paying for the greater part of that construction today. This is an effort to reach out on the farm-to-market roads and benefit not only those who are tourists, and who move from State to State over our highways but to give passable roads, all-weather roads, to the farmers and others who live in the rural sections.

I hope this amendment will be adopted in order that there may be no delay in carrying out the purpose of section 7 of the bill. The title to the roads is in the county authorities. If the Secretary of Agriculture should see fit in any case under the provisions of this amendment, he could deal with and through the county authorities rather than through the State highway departments. That is all the amendment provides.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. I observe that the amendment, as printed, refers to page 6, line 3. Is not that a mistake?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment was changed with pencil in the copy I sent to the desk. I intended to propose its insertion on page 7, line 3.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator intend to have it follow the words "public-school bus routes"?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the proper place for the amendment, to follow the words "public-school bus routes."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to emphasize what my colleague [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, that this amendment is merely permissive. It gives the Bureau of Public Roads the permissive power, wholly within its jurisdiction as to the particular \$25,000,000 appropriated by the

bill, to deal with the county authorities rather than with the State highway boards.

My colleague has called attention to the fact that in Georgia, and, I have no doubt, in many other States, the State highway board has no jurisdiction whatever over the farm-to-market or feeder roads unless they happen to constitute a part of the State highway system or the Federal-aid system. The State highway boards have jurisdiction, of course, over both the State highway and the Federal-aid systems.

There is another matter which it seems to me might be taken into consideration. This amendment might well go to conference, and the matter be there considered; and I think it would be quite proper to limit it, perhaps, to the 2 years covered by the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned, I see no reason why the amendment cannot be taken to conference and worked out there if there is any trouble about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest to the junior Senator from Georgia that if the amendment were limited to the fiscal years 1936 and 1937 it would not be permanent legislation.

The section which the Senators from Georgia are seeking to amend applies to the fiscal years 1938 and 1939, and is merely an authorization for future appropriations. The situation the Senators are seeking to improve is one that exists during the present fiscal year and will probably exist during the fiscal year beginning July 1 next. Can the Senator suggest how to change the amendment so as to provide, as is the case of paragraph (d) of section 1 of the bill, that the exception to the regular procedure shall be applicable only within the fiscal years 1936 and 1937?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think my colleague and I would have no objection at all to making the amendment applicable to those years, because if in the meantime it seemed desirable to continue it, of course, it could be continued.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest that the amendment be modified, in line 4, so as to read:

That in carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, during the fiscal years 1936 or 1937—

And so forth.

Mr. GEORGE. That would be quite agreeable to me, if it is to my colleague—we offered the amendment jointly—because it will all be in conference anyway.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I know of no reason why the change suggested by the Senator from Arizona should not be made, but I am of the opinion it could be done as well in conference as on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would be preferable to be able to say that what we are trying to do is to meet an existing emergency, rather than to anticipate future difficulties.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to modify the amendment as suggested by the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the junior Senator from Georgia, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LUCILLE M'CLURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1827) for the relief of Lucille McClure.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon,

and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LOGAN, Mr. SCHWELLENBACH, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODES OF CRIMINAL AND CIVIL PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1379) to amend section 103 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the Canal Zone and section 542 of the Code of Civil Procedure for the Canal Zone.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senate passed a bill relating to the disposition of fees received by marshals, clerks, and other officers in the Panama Canal Zone. The House struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a provision a little different from that adopted by the Senate. I suggest that the amendments of the House be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 981 of title 4, Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 981. It shall be lawful for the clerk of the district court, referees, and commissioners appointed by the district court, the marshal, magistrates, constables, and other officers and persons hereinafter mentioned, together with their assistants and deputies, to demand and receive the hereinafter-mentioned fees and no more. All fees collected by officers drawing a salary or compensation from the Government, other than those collected by the clerk of the district court and the marshal, shall be paid over to the collector of the Panama Canal. The clerk of the district court and the marshal shall receive, deposit, and account for all public moneys collected by them in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations governing the receipt and disposition of moneys by clerks of United States district courts and United States marshals, respectively, in the continental United States, exclusive of Alaska."

"Sec. 2. That section 843 of title 6, Canal Zone Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 843. The clerk shall receive, deposit, and account for all public moneys collected by him in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations governing the receipt and disposition of moneys by clerks of the United States district courts in the continental United States, exclusive of Alaska."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 981 of title 4, and section 843 of title 6 of the Canal Zone Code."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

DIRIGIBLE "SHENANDOAH" MEMORIAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10544, authorizing the erection of a memorial to those who met their death in the wreck of the dirigible *Shenandoah*.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount involved?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is a bill authorizing the erection of a tablet at the spot where the heroes of the *Shenandoah* lost their lives some years ago.

Mr. McNARY. I recall the tragic occurrence. What amount of money is involved?

Mr. BARKLEY. Two thousand five hundred dollars. It is a House bill, and it is desired that action be taken on it at once.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United

States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Works Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Works Administration be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I have about 500 routine nominations in the Army to report. It would be quite an expense to print the names, and I ask that I may report the nominations without having them printed, and I ask that they be confirmed at this time. As I have said, they are routine nominations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this is rather a unique request.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We took this action with about 4,000 nominations soon after the promotion bill was enacted. This is another batch of promotions under that act, principally of first lieutenants and second lieutenants, and one or two higher officers, and a few transfers.

Mr. McNARY. These are nominations of officers who automatically reach the respective grades?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Has the committee passed on all of them?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the reports are received, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

RECESS TO MONDAY

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 11, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of Apr. 24), 1936

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, revocable for 2 years, from the 4th day of June 1936:

John M. Alford	Arthur L. Gustafson
Carl H. Amme, Jr.	Willard M. Hanger
Ralph W. Arndt	James R. Hansen
Henry A. Arnold	Mark Hattan
Joseph H. Barker, Jr.	Frank E. Hayler
Harry A. Barnard, Jr.	Jack "W" Hays
James H. Barnard	John D. Hewitt, 3d
John Baumeister, Jr.	Carl W. Heywood
Walter B. Bayless	Robert M. Higginson
Fred G. Bennett	Edward E. Hoffman
Warfield C. Bennett, Jr.	Edmund J. Hoffman
Paul H. Bjarnason	William G. Holman
William Blenman	Harry F. Holmshaw, Jr.
John D. Blitch	Charles E. Houston
John N. Boland	William T. Hulson
Robert A. Bonin	Ralph R. Humes
Walter W. Boyd	Ernest W. Humphrey
Warren W. Bradley	Gould Hunter
Alfred W. Brown, Jr.	John C. Hunter
David S. Brown	Charles H. Hutchins
James A. Brown	Edward J. Huxtable, Jr.
Richard S. Bull, Jr.	Joseph B. Icenhower
Ronald E. Burcher	Johns H. Janney
Herbert von A. Burkart	Billy Johnson
Ovid McM. Butler	Webster C. Johnson
Robert H. Caldwell	William J. Johnston
John H. Carmichael	Seymour Karasyk
Frederic A. Chénault	William M. Kaufman
James A. Coddington	Robert F. Kelly
Otis R. Cole, Jr.	Thomas K. Kimmel
Walter V. Combs, Jr.	Ed R. King, Jr.
David R. Connoles	Thomas S. King, Jr.
Joseph A. Coppola	John J. Kircher
John M. Court	Harlan G. Kirkpatrick
Earl R. Crawford	John K. Knapper
Logan Cresap, Jr.	Otto F. Kolb, Jr.
Joseph A. Crook	Roy J. Krogh
Jack R. Crutchfield	Edwin L. Kyte
Thomas B. Dabney	Dallas M. Laizure
John J. Daub, Jr.	Frank G. Law
Harlan R. Dickson	William E. Lewis
Donald G. Dockum	Frederick I. Lincoln
Charles R. Eisenbach	David A. Lindsay
William A. Ellis	Everett M. Link, Jr.
Ralph A. Embree	Kenneth C. Lovell
Daniel McE. Entler, Jr.	Theodore C. Lyster, Jr.
Joseph L. Evans	Hoyt D. Mann
Allen R. Faust	Charles S. Manning, Jr.
Allan F. Fleming	Porter W. Maxwell
Parker L. Folsom	Ray W. Mayhew
Gordon Fowler	James W. McCauley
Richard L. Fowler	Jasper N. McDonald, Jr.
Philip H. Fox	Robert "W" McElrath
Albert B. Furer	Malcolm C. McGrath
John K. Fyfe	Richard W. Meyers
Norman C. Gillette, Jr.	Fred D. Michael
Frank C. Graham	Sydney R. Miller, Jr.
James S. Gray, Jr.	John R. Millett
Richard Gray	Jack C. Moore
Francis A. Greenup	Robert C. Morton
George W. Grider	Richard L. Myers
William T. Groner	Willard E. Neve
Louis J. Gulliver, Jr.	Robert L. Neyman
Donald G. Gumz	Roscoe F. Nicholson

Chester W. Nimitz, Jr.	Forrest W. Simoneau
John V. Noel, Jr.	Robert C. Sleight
Robert E. Odening	Gilven M. Slonim
Bennett C. Oelheim	William A. Small
James W. O'Grady	Millard J. Smith
Ellis B. Orr	James J. Southerland, 2d
John M. Oseth	Herbert D. Sprenger
Fitzhugh L. Palmer, Jr.	Frank G. Springer
Nicholas A. Pananides	Harry B. Stark
William B. Parham	Paul C. Stimson
Joseph H. Patterson	Paul E. Summers
Van O. Perkins	Archibald E. Teall
Jewett O. Phillips, Jr.	Richard A. Teel
Dale F. Pinkerton	James H. Terry, Jr.
Richard R. Pratt	Robert A. Thacher
John P. Preston	Wilbur W. Thing
William N. Price	William B. Thomas
Delmer F. Quackenbush, Jr.	Floyd T. Thompson
John B. Rawlings	Marshall F. Thompson
Charles I. Raymond, Jr.	Ray S. Thompson, Jr.
Marion J. Reed	Francis M. Traynor
Joseph E. Rice	Stanton M. Trott
David C. Richardson	John H. Turner
Eugene V. Riewe	Renfro Turner, Jr.
Frank M. Robinson	Alexander K. Tyree
Henry A. Romberg	Raymond W. Vogel, Jr.
Leroy W. Ross	George A. Wagner, Jr.
James B. Rutter, Jr.	Raymond A. Walsh, Jr.
Paul B. Ryan	Bruce R. Ware, 3d
John F. Ryder	August F. Weinell
Thomas W. Samuel	William H. Wendell
Merrill M. Sanford	George H. Whiting
Walter F. Schlech, Jr.	Phillip G. Wild, Jr.
Henry C. Schwaner, Jr.	Robert J. Williams
David S. Seaman, Jr.	Donald E. Willman
Dayton A. Seiler	Donald W. Wilson
James L. Semmes	George M. Winne
Ormond G. Sexton	Jonathon L. W. Woodville, Jr.
Frederick C. Seyford	Sherman "E" Wright, Jr.
James C. Shaw	William H. Wright
William H. Shea, Jr.	Jud F. Yoho, Jr.
Sydney S. Sherby	David Zabriskie, Jr.
Philip E. Shetehelm	Charles M. Holcombe
Samuel G. Shilling	Ted E. Pulos

Capt. Julius C. Townsend to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of May 1936.

Commander Edward J. Foy to be a captain in the Navy from the 3d day of January 1936.

Lt. Comdr. Frank D. Wagner to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of January 1936.

Lt. Harley F. Cope to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of May 1936.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Walter C. Ford to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January 1936.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William Kirton, Jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of February 1936.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of June 1936:

David L. Martineau
Charles W. Travis

Naval Constructor Ralph D. Weyerbacher to be a commander in the Navy for aeronautical engineering duty only from the 6th day of February 1922, in accordance with the act of Congress approved June 5, 1935.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of Apr. 24), 1936

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Robert Frazer to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.
Douglas Jenkins to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.
Arthur Garrels to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.
Charles M. Hathaway, Jr., to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Thomas D. Bowman to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Arthur C. Frost to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Philip Holland to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Charles L. Hoover to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Walter A. Adams to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Joseph W. Ballantine to be Secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Charles R. Cameron to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Monnett B. Davis to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Lowell C. Pinkerton to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Kenneth S. Patton to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

Ray Atherton to be consul general.

Ferdinand L. Mayer to be consul general.

G. Howland Shaw to be consul general.

Alexander C. Kirk to be consul general.

Edwin C. Wilson to be consul general.

Louis Sussdorff, Jr., to be consul general.

Hallett Johnson to be consul general.

Herschel V. Johnson to be consul general.

Edward L. Reed to be consul general.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Irl D. Brent to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Michigan.

Claude C. Hockley to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Oregon.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Harvey F. Johnson to be engineer in chief.

Oscar C. Rohnke to be lieutenant (junior grade).

William R. Kenly to be chief machinist.

Frank F. Crump to be chief machinist.

Olaf G. Tobiasson to be chief carpenter.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Herbert Jay Brees.

TO BE CHAPLAIN WITH THE RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT

Martin Carl Poch

Wallace Irving Wolverton

Paul Judson Maddox

William Lewis Cooper

James Corey Bean

Charles Irving Carpenter

James Thomas Wilson

Silas Edward Decker

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

First Lt. Joseph Edward Gill.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lt. Howard Elwyn Webster.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lt. Edwin Gantt Hickman.

Second Lt. Oliver Prescott Robinson, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONELS

Condon Carlton McCornack, Medical Corps.

Glenn Irving Jones, Medical Corps.

Charles Carroll Demmer, Medical Corps.

TO BE CHAPLAIN WITH RANK OF COLONEL

Louis Augustus Carter.

TO BE CAPTAINS

William Albert Todd, Jr., Medical Corps.

James Bowdoin Stapleton, Medical Corps.

Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, Medical Corps.

Robert Stultz Brua, Medical Corps.

William Clyde Baker, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

William Livingston Bayer, Signal Corps.

Herbert William Ehr Gott, Corps of Engineers.

Turner Ashby Sims, Jr., Air Corps.

Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt, Signal Corps.

William Hunt Mills, Corps of Engineers.

Keith Richard Barney, Corps of Engineers.

Elvin Ragnvald Heiberg, Corps of Engineers.

Francis Xavier Purcell, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

Harold Anthony Brusher, Coast Artillery Corps.

Raymond Coleman Maude, Signal Corps.

Samuel Wallace Van Meter, Air Corps.

Richard Wyman Pearson, Corps of Engineers.

Irving Arthur Duffy, Field Artillery.

William Preston Corderman, Signal Corps.

Clerin Rodney Smith, Corps of Engineers.

Fiorre John Stagliano, Finance Department.

Parker Montrose Reeve, Corps of Engineers.

Harry Warren Johnson, Cavalry.

Rufus Leonidas Land, Cavalry.

James Norvell Krueger, Corps of Engineers.

Robert Kinzie McDonough, Corps of Engineers.

Donald Prentice Booth, Corps of Engineers.

Arthur August Gerhart Kirchhoff, Corps of Engineers.

William Murlin Creasy, Jr., Chemical Warfare Service.

Alfred Henry Johnson, Air Corps.

Ralph Morris Osborne, Field Artillery.

Norman Arthur Matthias, Corps of Engineers.

Lincoln Jones, Jr., Infantry.

Malcolm Raymond Kammerer, Infantry.

Robert Eugene Mousseau Des Isles, Corps of Engineers.

William Edward House, Ordnance Department.

James Roy Andersen, Ordnance Department.

Benjamin Easton Thurston, Infantry.

Harold McClure Forde, Cavalry.

William Alexander Walker, Field Artillery.

John Colt Beaumont Elliott, Corps of Engineers.

Samuel Russ Harris, Jr., Air Corps.

Lewis Sherrill Griffing, Field Artillery.

Waldo Eugene Laidlaw, Ordnance Department.

Hamer Pace Ford, Infantry.

John Ensor Perman, Field Artillery.

George William Hickman, Jr., Infantry.

Earl Jerome Murphy, Field Artillery.

Holger Nelson Toftoy, Coast Artillery Corps.

Harold Doud, Infantry.

David Louis Van Syckle, Ordnance Department.

Wallace Hayden Barnes, Cavalry.

Shelton Ezra Prudhomme, Air Corps.

John Paul Doyle, Jr., Air Corps.

Leon William Johnson, Air Corps.

Richard Walden Mayo, Field Artillery.

Earl Lewis Ringler, Infantry.

George Voegelé Ehrhardt, Cavalry.

Walter Clement Stanton, Field Artillery.

Frank Sayles Bowen, Jr., Infantry.

Malcolm Dudley Jones, Jr., Cavalry.

William Peirce Ennis, Jr., Field Artillery.

Guy Beasley Henderson, Air Corps.

Richard Keith McMaster, Field Artillery.

Charles Dutton Mc Nerney, Infantry.

Clair McKinley Conzelman, Coast Artillery Corps.

Samuel Pickens Collins, Field Artillery.

John Cline Strickler, Field Artillery.

Edwin Howard Feather, Infantry.

Theodore Charles Wenzlaff, Cavalry.

William Jesse Deyo, Jr., Infantry.

Benjamin Peter Heiser, Field Artillery.

John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., Cavalry.

Egon Rowland Tausch, Cavalry.

Alexander Randolph Sewall, Field Artillery.

Prentice Edward Yeomans, Cavalry.

Paul Hamilton, Infantry.

Charles Clifford Sloane, Jr., Infantry.

Charles Winchell McGeehan, Coast Artillery Corps.

James Russell Wheaton, Field Artillery.

Basil Littleton Riggs, Cavalry.

Malcolm Hobson Harwell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Henry Raymond Baxter, Air Corps.
 Roy Silverman, Infantry.
 Tyler Calhoun, Jr., Field Artillery.
 Richard Hanson Grinder, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Edwin James Van Horne, Infantry.
 Robert Charles Ross, Field Artillery.
 Harry Purnell Storke, Field Artillery.
 Thomas Edward Pickett Barbour, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
 Joseph Halversen, Infantry.
 Marvin Westlake Peck, Infantry.
 George Albert Smith, Jr., Infantry.
 Eugene Charles Smallwood, Coast Artillery Corps.
 James Robert Davidson, Infantry.
 Frank Freeman Miter, Coast Artillery Corps.
 John Prichard Woodbridge, Field Artillery.
 Thomas Edward de Shazo, Field Artillery.
 Kenneth Frease March, Infantry.
 Frederick Francis Scheffler, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Robert Sylvester Nourse, Infantry.
 Richard Edward O'Connor, Field Artillery.
 John Sieba Roosma, Infantry.
 John Anthony McFarland, Field Artillery.
 Morris Robert Nelson, Air Corps.
 Kenneth Perry McNaughton, Air Corps.
 John Harvey Kane, Infantry.
 Russell Potter Reeder, Jr., Infantry.
 Merson Leon Skinner, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Charles Draper William Canham, Infantry.
 Edward Harold McDaniel, Infantry.
 Willet John Baird, Infantry.
 Paul John Black, Infantry.
 Clifton Coleman Carter, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Paul Leroy Carroll, Infantry.
 Edward Lyman Munson, Jr., Infantry.
 James Bell Burwell, Air Corps.
 Frederick Prall Munson, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.
 Thomas Howard James, Infantry.
 Wilson Turner Douglas, Infantry.
 John Robert Burns, Chemical Warfare Service.
 Marvin John McKinney, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Thomas Benjamin White, Coast Artillery Corps.
 William Benjamin Hawthorne, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Thomas Randall Horton, Infantry.
 Roy Jacob Herte, Infantry.
 James Oka Wade, Infantry.
 Brookner West Brady, Infantry.
 Harry McNeill Grizzard, Infantry.
 Charles Herman Deerwester, Air Corps.
 Charles Winslow O'Connor, Air Corps.
 Bernard Alexander Bridget, Air Corps.
 Charles Arthur Bassett, Air Corps.
 Grant Albert Williams, Cavalry.
 Norman Mahlon Winn, Cavalry.
 Narcisse Lionel Cote, Air Corps.
 George Hall Sparhawk, Air Corps.
 John Felix Guillett, Air Corps.
 Dixon McCarty Allison, Air Corps.
 Joel G. O'Neal, Air Corps.
 Alva Lee Harvey, Air Corps.
 Robert Lee Miller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 John Osman Taylor, Field Artillery.
 Frank Neuman Leakey, Field Artillery.
 George Olaf Norman Lodoen, Infantry.
 Lindsey Roscoe Wingfield, Field Artillery.
 Philip James Henderson, Infantry.
 Edgar Richard Curtis Ward, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Oliver Wolcott van den Berg, Field Artillery.
 Ralph Eugene Rumbold, Infantry.
 Noble Theodore Haakensen, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Paul Arthur Ridge, Cavalry.
 James William Andrew, Air Corps.
 Charles Arthur Ross, Air Corps.

George J. Eppright, Air Corps.
 Frank Dunne Klein, Air Corps.
 William Vance Davis, Coast Artillery Corps.
 William Crawford D. Bridges, Corps of Engineers.
 Harry Joseph Wheaton, Infantry.
 George John Zimmerman, Corps of Engineers.
 John Albert Dabney, Infantry.
 John Emmett Walker, Infantry.
 Rothwell Hutton Brown, Infantry.
 Irvin Schindler, Field Artillery.
 Charles Owen Wiseloge, Field Artillery.
 Albert Jerome Thackston, Jr., Infantry.
 Joseph Roy Dougherty, Infantry.
 Arthur Hodgkins Bender, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Clarence Daniel Wheeler, Air Corps.
 Walter Sylvester Lee, Air Corps.
 Manning Eugene Tillery, Air Corps.
 Cleo Zachariah Shugart, Infantry.
 William Preston Grace, Jr., Infantry.
 Claude Augustus Billingsley, Field Artillery.
 Gerald Geoffrey Johnston, Air Corps.
 Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., Air Corps.
 John Francis Fiske, Field Artillery.
 Malcolm Faulhaber, Field Artillery.
 Ross Drum Lustenberger, Corps of Engineers.
 John Caswell Crosthwaite, Air Corps.
 Jonathan Dean Hawkins, Infantry.
 Clarence Shortridge Irvine, Air Corps.
 Mason Harley Lucas, Field Artillery.
 Ralph Emerson Holmes, Air Corps.
 Darr Hayes Alkire, Air Corps.
 Francis Albert Rudolph, Infantry.
 Thurston H. Baxter, Air Corps.
 Albert Gallatin Franklin, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Chester Erwin Margrave, Field Artillery.
 John Albert Tarro, Air Corps.
 John Titcomb Sprague, Air Corps.
 Frederick August Bacher, Jr., Air Corps.
 Walter Byron Larew, Signal Corps.
 Edward James Doyle, Cavalry.
 William Orsen Van Giesen, Corps of Engineers.
 Ward Jackson Davies, Air Corps.
 Frank Coffin Holbrook, Field Artillery.
 Yantis Halbert Taylor, Air Corps.
 Newell Edward Watts, Infantry.
 George Leroy Murray, Air Corps.
 Claire Stroh, Air Corps.
 Charles William Stratton, Field Artillery.
 Charles Albert Sheldon, Cavalry.
 Francis Edgar Cheattle, Air Corps.
 Stewart Yeo, Field Artillery.
 Robert Jones Moulton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 James Trimble Brown, Infantry.
 Charles Weller McCarthy, Infantry.
 Benjamin Branche Talley, Corps of Engineers.
 John Gibson Van Houten, Infantry.
 Kenneth Holmes Kinsler, Infantry.
 Edgar Albert Gans, Infantry.
 Howard Ravenscroft Johnson, Infantry.
 Albert Samuel Baron, Coast Artillery Corps.
 George Edwin Steinmeyer, Jr., Infantry.
 Arthur Joseph Lehman, Air Corps.
 Oscar Frederick Carlson, Air Corps.
 George Edley Henry, Air Corps.
 Richard Dodge Reeve, Air Corps.
 Henry Louis Luongo, Infantry.
 Herbert Butler Powell, Infantry.
 Signa Allen Gilkey, Air Corps.
 Edward Francis Merchant, Infantry.
 Layton Allen Zimmer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Jay B. Lovless, Infantry.
 Clinton William Davies, Air Corps.
 James Byron Colson, Infantry.
 William Hans Brunke, Infantry.
 Thomas Beverley Harper, Infantry.

Paul August Jaccard, Coast Artillery Corps.
James David O'Brien, Infantry.
Reuben Kyle, Jr., Air Corps.
Paul Burnham Nelson, Coast Artillery Corps.
Harvey Flynn Dyer, Air Corps.
Robert Bartlett McCleave, Infantry.
John Edwin Mortimer, Coast Artillery Corps.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Kenneth E. Fields, Corps of Engineers.
George Wood Beeler, Corps of Engineers.
John Joseph Danis, Corps of Engineers.
Duncan Hallock, Corps of Engineers.
Alfred Dodd Starbird, Corps of Engineers.
John Douglas Matheson, Corps of Engineers.
Richard Davis Meyer, Corps of Engineers.
Alden Kingsland Sibley, Corps of Engineers, subject to examination required by law.
Paul R. Gowen, Air Corps.
Marshall Bonner, Air Corps.
Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, Corps of Engineers.
Clayton Samuel Gates, Corps of Engineers.
James Vance Hagan, Corps of Engineers.
Robert Campbell Tripp, Corps of Engineers.
Edward George Herb, Corps of Engineers.
William Jonas Ely, Corps of Engineers.
John Thomas Honeycutt, Field Artillery.
William Allen Harris, Field Artillery.
Charles Russell Broshous, Corps of Engineers.
Percival Ernest Gabel, Air Corps.
John Gardner Shinkle, Field Artillery.
Bernard Card, Corps of Engineers.
Hoy D. Davis, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
Alvin Charles Welling, Corps of Engineers.
William Harris Ball, Coast Artillery Corps.
Douglas Charles Davis, Corps of Engineers.
Ellsworth Barricklow Downing, Corps of Engineers.
Robert Amrine Turner, Coast Artillery Corps.
David Warren Gray, Infantry.
Frank Sherman Henry, Cavalry.
William Orin Blandford, Infantry.
Walter Adonis Downing, Jr., Field Artillery.
Guy Cecil Lothrop, Field Artillery.
Robert Crain Leslie, Coast Artillery Corps.
John Edward Watters, Signal Corps.
Francis Joseph McMorro, Coast Artillery Corps.
Charles Golding Dunn, Coast Artillery Corps.
Thomas Allen Glass, Coast Artillery Corps.
Thomas Samuel Moorman, Jr., Air Corps.
Harry Julian, Coast Artillery Corps.
Dabney Ray Corum, Coast Artillery Corps.
Lauren Whitford Merriam, Infantry.
Herbert George Sparrow, Field Artillery.
Howard Elwyn Webster, Corps of Engineers.
Robert Wolcott Meals, Field Artillery.
Walter August Jensen, Infantry.
Edward Bodeau, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Livingston Travis, Air Corps.
Thomas Burns Hall, Air Corps.
Chalmer Kirk McClelland, Jr., Field Artillery.
Ferdinand Marion Humphries, Coast Artillery Corps.
David Nicholas Crickette, Air Corps.
John Denton Armitage, Field Artillery.
Theodore John Conway, Infantry.
Clayton Earl Mullins, Corps of Engineers.
Paul Elton LaDue, Corps of Engineers.
Edward Joseph Hale, Air Corps.
William Joseph Daniel, Field Artillery.
Chester Arthur Dahlen, Infantry.
John Joseph Lane, Coast Artillery Corps.
Travis Monroe Hetherington, Air Corps.
Taylor Stephen Pollock, Field Artillery.
Edgar Ozzo Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps.
Ira Whitehead Cory, Coast Artillery Corps.
William York Frenz, Field Artillery.

Thomas Kocher MacNair, Coast Artillery Corps.
James Hilliard Polk, Cavalry.
John Glenn Armstrong, Air Corps.
Samuel Edward Otto, Field Artillery.
Harry Winfield Schenck, Coast Artillery Corps.
Lamar Cecil Ratcliffe, Coast Artillery Corps.
Gerald Chapman, Field Artillery.
Robert John Lawlor, Coast Artillery Corps.
Arthur Alfred McCrary, Coast Artillery Corps.
Daniel Parker, Jr., Field Artillery.
Edgar Haskell Kibler, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
Harold Cooper Donnelly, Coast Artillery Corps.
Morris Oswald Edwards, Infantry.
William Oscar Senter, Air Corps.
Frank Joseph Zeller, Coast Artillery Corps.
Richard Louis Matteson, Coast Artillery Corps.
Sidney Francis Giffin, Coast Artillery Corps.
Robert Beall Franklin, Field Artillery.
William Gordon Bartlett, Cavalry.
Paul Nelson Gillon, Coast Artillery Corps.
Paul Rudolf Walters, Field Artillery.
Vernon Cleveland Smith, Air Corps.
Edward Thorndike Ashworth, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Bruce Logan, Coast Artillery Corps.
Lafar Lipscomb, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
Harry Stephen Bishop, Air Corps.
Harry Sheldon Tubbs, Coast Artillery Corps.
Herman Henry Kaesser, Jr., Infantry.
Francis Hill, Field Artillery.
Herbert Charles Plapp, Field Artillery.
Lassiter Albert Mason, Field Artillery.
Joseph Henry O'Malley, Cavalry.
Frederic Henry Fairchild, Coast Artillery Corps.
Emory Edwin Hackman, Coast Artillery Corps.
George Hobart Chapman, Jr., Infantry.
Patrick William Guiney, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
John Frederick Thorlin, Coast Artillery Corps.
Frank Harris Shepardson, Coast Artillery Corps.
William George Fritz, Coast Artillery Corps.
Jack Wellington Turner, Cavalry.
Robert Worman Hain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Charles Goyer Patterson, Coast Artillery Corps.
Clyde Lucken Jones, Infantry.
Victor Edward Maston, Infantry.
Ethan Allen Chapman, Coast Artillery Corps.
Oren Eugene Hurlbut, Infantry.
Harrison King, Field Artillery.
George Warren White, Infantry.
Richard Park, Jr., Field Artillery.
Beverly DeWitt Jones, Field Artillery.
William Hadley Richardson, Jr., Field Artillery.
Frank Patterson Hunter, Jr., Air Corps.
George Harold Crawford, Coast Artillery Corps.
Harold Roth Maddux, Air Corps.
John Roosevelt Brindley, Field Artillery.
Dwight Divine, 2d, Air Corps.
Samuel McFarland McReynolds, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
Marcus Tague, Field Artillery.
Joseph Leonard Cowhey, Field Artillery.
Edward Deane Marshall, Air Corps.
George Leon Van Way, Infantry.
Newell Charles James, Field Artillery.
Charles Henry Chase, Infantry.
David Virgil Adamson, Cavalry.
John William Ferris, Field Artillery.
Robert Penn Thompson, Field Artillery.
Russell Roland Klanderman, Infantry.
James Leo Dalton, 2d, Cavalry.
Neil Merton Wallace, Field Artillery.
William Paul Whelihan, Field Artillery.
Marshall Woodruff Frame, Cavalry.
Robin George Speiser, Field Artillery.
William James Given, Jr., Field Artillery.
Harry Nelson Burkhalter, Jr., Air Corps.
Avery John Cooper, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

Lawrence Browning Kelley, Air Corps.
Stephen Ogden Fuqua, Jr., Infantry.
Hardin Leonard Olson, Infantry.
Benedict Ray, Infantry.
Cam Longley, Jr., Field Artillery.
Carlyle Walton Phillips, Air Corps.
Robert Benton Neely, Field Artillery.
Phillip Henshaw Pope, Field Artillery.
William John Ledward, Coast Artillery Corps.
Joseph Warren Stilwell, Jr., Infantry.
Peter Paul Bernd, Infantry.
Arthur Robert Cyr, Infantry.
Arthur Wilson Tyson, Infantry.
Joseph Menzie Pittman, Infantry.
George Allen Carver, Field Artillery.
Gordon Pendleton Larson, Infantry.
Thomas Joseph O'Connor, Infantry.
George Rushmore Gretser, Infantry.
Robert Totten, Field Artillery.
Douglas Moore Cairns, Air Corps.
Sherburne Whipple, Jr., Cavalry.
Edgar Collins Doleman, Infantry.
Cyril Joseph Letzelter, Infantry.
William Orlando Darby, Field Artillery.
Daniel Light Hine, Field Artillery.
Jack Wallace Rudolph, Infantry.
John Abell Cleveland, Jr., Infantry.
George Thomas Powers, 3d, Field Artillery.
Joshua Robert Messersmith, Field Artillery.
Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., Infantry.
Edwin Martin Cahill, Cavalry.
William Francis Ryan, Field Artillery.
Raymond Emerson Kendall, Infantry.
James Henry Skinner, Field Artillery.
Anthony Frank Kleitz, Jr., Cavalry.
Paul Thomas Carroll, Infantry.
Richard John Meyer, Air Corps.
Randolph Whiting Fletter, Field Artillery.
Charles Harlow Miles, Jr., Infantry.
Humbert Joseph Versace, Field Artillery.
Milton Fredrick Summerfelt, Air Corps.
Franklin Guest Smith, Field Artillery.
William Henry Baumer, Jr., Infantry.
Gabriel Poillon Disosway, Air Corps.
James Pugh Pearson, Jr., Field Artillery.
Earl Jacob Macherey, Infantry.
Ralph Alspaugh, Infantry.
Emile Jeantet Greco, Field Artillery.
Gerald Lorenzo Roberson, Field Artillery.
Joseph Edward Bastion, Jr., Cavalry.
Jewell Burch Shields, Air Corps.
Thomas Herbert Beck, Infantry.
Maurice Evans Kaiser, Infantry.
Benjamin Thomas Harris, Infantry.
Gardner Wellington Porter, Infantry.
Harry William Sweeting, Jr., Infantry.
Franklin Stone Henley, Air Corps.
Cyrus Abda Dolph, 3d, Infantry.
John Martin Breit, Infantry.
Harold Lindsay Richey, Cavalry.
Charles Fauntleroy Harrison, Cavalry.
Thomas Bowes Evans, Infantry.
Walter Andrew Valerious Fleckenstein, Infantry.
Franklin Gibney Rothwell, Infantry.
Leo Harold Heintz, Infantry.
William Howard Thompson, Cavalry.
William Fant Damon, Jr., Cavalry.
William Gray Sills, Infantry.
Robert Evans Arnette, Jr., Cavalry.
Francis Clay Bridgewater, Cavalry.
Ernest Mikell Clarke, Infantry.
Victor Haller King, Coast Artillery Corps.
Daniel W. Smith, Infantry.
Thomas de Nyse Flynn, Coast Artillery Corps.
Harold Keith Johnson, Infantry.

James Orr Boswell, Infantry.
David Parker Gibbs, Signal Corps.
William Howard Garrett Fuller, Infantry.
Gordon Milo Eyler, Infantry.
Cordes Fredrich Tiemann, Air Corps.
Maddrey Allen Solomon, Infantry.
Lyle William Bernard, Infantry.
Shelby Francis Williams, Infantry.
Jean Evans Engler, Infantry.
Corwin Paul Vansant, Jr., Infantry.
Walter Abner Huntsberry, Infantry.
Andrew Donald Stephenson, Infantry.
Douglas Graver Gilbert, Infantry.
Frank Laurence Elder, Infantry.
Donald Cameron Cubbison, Jr., Cavalry.
Amaury Manuel Gandia, Infantry.
Samuel Abner Mundell, Air Corps.
Robert Harrold Bayne, Cavalry.
Bruce von Gerichten Scott, Air Corps.
Felix Louis Vidal, Air Corps.
Gwinn Ulm Porter, Infantry.
Frederick Robert Zierath, Infantry.
Robert Hulburt Douglas, Infantry.
Carl Darnell, Jr., Field Artillery.
Joseph Brice Crawford, Infantry.
Frederick William Coleman, 3d, Infantry.
Raymond Wiltse Sellers, Infantry.
Matthew William Kane, Cavalry.
Alton Alexander Denton, Infantry.
Jules Verne Richardson, Cavalry.
Frederick William Gibb, Infantry.
Norman Kemp Markle, Jr., Cavalry.
Jesse Martin Hawkins, Jr., Cavalry.
Ralph Talbot, 3d, Infantry.
Charles Ellsworth Leydecker, Cavalry.
Austin Andrew Miller, Infantry.
Henry Walter Herlong, Infantry.
Morris King Henderson, Infantry.
Earl Francis Signer, Air Corps.
Richard Thomas King, Jr., Air Corps.
John Daniel O'Reilly, Infantry.
Roland Arthur Elliott, Jr., Infantry.
Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Jr., Infantry.
Edson Schull, Infantry.
Joel Lyen Mathews, Infantry.
Royal Reynolds, Jr., Infantry.
George Hollie Bishop, Jr., Infantry.
Stephen B. Mack, Air Corps.
Lawrence Kermit White, Infantry.
Graydon Casper Essman, Infantry.
Russell Franklin Akers, Jr., Infantry.
Claude Leslie Bowen, Jr., Infantry.
Duff Walker Sudduth, Infantry.
David Wagstaff, Jr., Cavalry.
Clyde Jarecki Hibler, Infantry.
James Rhoden Pritchard, Field Artillery.
James Dennis Underhill, Air Corps.
Robert Emmett Gallagher, Coast Artillery Corps.
Samuel Edward Gee, Infantry.
Alston Grimes, Infantry.
Nelson Parkyn Jackson, Air Corps.
Frederick Otto Hartel, Infantry.
Ivan Walter Parr, Jr., Infantry.
William Roberts Calhoun, Field Artillery.
Roy Dunscomb Gregory, Infantry.
Karl Truesdell, Jr., Air Corps.
Glenn Howbert Garrison, Infantry.
Edson Duncan Raff, Infantry.
Chester Braddock Degavre, Infantry.
Erdmann Jellison Lowell, Infantry.
William Agin Bailey, Infantry.
Seymour Eldred Madison, Infantry.
Robin Bruce Epler, Air Corps.
John Newman Scoville, Infantry.
William Field Due, Infantry.

Peter Demosthenes Clainos, Infantry.
 John Frederick Schmelzer, Infantry.
 Sydney Dwight Grubbs, Jr., Air Corps.
 David Thomas Jellett, Infantry.
 Millard Loren Haskin, Air Corps.
 Joseph Anthony Remus, Infantry.
 Ben Harrell, Infantry.
 Richard Churchfield Blatt, Infantry.
 Richard Allen Ridsen, Infantry.
 Joseph Ermine Williams, Infantry.
 Miller Payne Warren, Jr., Infantry.
 Stanley Nelson Lonning, Infantry.
 Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., Infantry.
 William Wilson Quinn, Infantry.
 Charner Weaver Powell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Charles Pearce Bellican, Infantry.
 Edward Spalding Ehlen, Infantry.
 Thomas Tallant Kilday, Infantry.
 Richard Mattern Montgomery, Air Corps.
 Charles Hoffman Pottenger, Air Corps.
 John Roberts Kimmell, Jr., Infantry.
 William Vernard Thompson, Infantry.
 Gerald Carrington Simpson, Infantry.
 Robert Wilkinson Rayburn, Cavalry.
 John Baird Shinberger, Cavalry.
 Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, Infantry.

PROMOTION IN THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Emmanuel Salvador Cepeda, Philippine Scouts.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

Samuel Tilden Lawton to be brigadier general, National Guard of the United States.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

James W. Barr, Big Creek.
 Lynn A. Hogue, Brea.
 Melvin L. Horine, Denair.
 Albert J. Frutchey, Los Nietos.
 Charlie M. Seargeant, Manhattan Beach.
 Talbot Bielefeldt, Placentia.
 George H. German, Port Chicago.
 Noah A. Stump, Rosemead.
 Carl A. Romer, San Juan Capistrano.
 Irene C. Witmer, Solana Beach.
 Marvin O. Drake, Terra Bella.
 Sam H. Long, Tustin.

LOUISIANA

Raleigh Leslie Wyble, Melville.

MASSACHUSETTS

Richard Mullen, Athol.
 Mary G. Haniffin, Belchertown.
 Hazel M. Cairns, Bernardston.
 Fred C. Small, Buzzards Bay.
 Patrick H. Haley, Chelmsford.
 Leon H. Thorner, Clifton.
 James J. Murtaugh, Hopkinton.
 William M. Higgins, Jr., Orleans.
 Ethyl M. Duffey, Scituate.
 Maryetta Browne, State Farm.
 Bertha M. West, Wianno.

NEVADA

Isaac L. Stone, McGill.

NEW YORK

Mattie C. Dellone, Bolivar.
 John F. McGovern, Caledonia.
 Jesse B. Kilburn, Cattaraugus.
 Michael O'Donnell, Cohoes.
 Raymond A. Switzer, Ebenezer.
 Arthur H. Walsh, Garrison.
 David J. McHenry, Granville.

Frederick W. Schadt, Jeffersonville.
 Ray G. Blyth, Macedon.
 Frank B. Rickard, Middleburg.
 Gertrude F. Tracey, Middleport.
 John Francis Dawson, Mineville.
 James P. Doyle, Nunda.
 Thomas A. Kenney, Ossining.
 Lewis N. S. Rockwell, Otisville.
 Herbert N. Griffin, Oxford.
 Edward H. O'Connor, Sherburne.
 Walter F. Herrling, Skaneateles.

NORTH CAROLINA

John G. Kennedy, Beulaville.
 Helen H. Leggett, Scotland Neck.
 Samuel R. Fowle, Jr., Washington.

OHIO

Michael A. Delsantro, Willoughby.

OKLAHOMA

Roy C. Bennett, Vian.

OREGON

Glen A. Henderson, Houlton.
 Inez C. Givan, Merrill.

VERMONT

Helen F. McKenna, Norwich.
 Harold J. Sheehan, Richmond.
 George M. Goodrich, South Royalton.

WYOMING

Arthur W. Crawford, Guernsey.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 8 (legislative day of Apr. 24), 1936

POSTMASTER

ARKANSAS

Edgar L. Adams to be postmaster at Stephens, in the State of Arkansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1936

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord and our Father, O satisfy us with Thy mercy, that we may rejoice and be glad all our days. Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants and Thy glory unto their children. We unite in a national tribute to mother. Hear us in these moments of praise and grateful retrospection. We rejoice that hers was the first face that brightened at our joys and wept at our tears. It was the first face on which divine love wrote its immortal message; it gave all and asked nothing. We thank Thee for the paths of childhood, where she first placed our wandering feet. We pray that her heavenly, sacrificial spirit may hover over our land. Then strife will cease, brotherly love will take the place of hatred, and men will follow the Golden Rule. We bless Thee, Almighty God, for her wonderful memory. May it abide with us as the inspiration of virtue, sacrifice, and religion, and unto Thee be praises forever. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 7, 1936, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5491. An act for the relief of Bethlehem Fabricators, Inc.;